CATHOLIC DOCTRINES EXPLAINED AND PROVED.

BY THE

REV. P. RYAN.

LONDON.
BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, LTD.
28, ORCHARD ST., W., AND 8-10 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

E. Drummond

CATHOLIC DOCTRINES
EXPLAINED AND PROVED.

CATHOLIC DOCTRINES

EXPLAINED AND PROVED.

BY THE

REV. P. RYAN.

PRICE 2s. 6d. NET, POST FREE.

LONDON: R. WASHBOURNE, 18 PATERNOSTER ROW.
DUBLIN: JAMES DUFFY & CO., LIMITED, 14 & 15 WELLINGTON QUAY,
MARKET WEIGHTON; MANAGER, ST. WILLIAM'S PRESS.

1897.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM.

All Rights Reserved.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

CHAPTER I.

Considerations for the Reader 1

CHAPTER II.

The Establishment of the Church 11

CHAPTER III.

The Unity of the Church 23

CHAPTER IV.

The Sanctity of the Church 30

CHAPTER V.

The Catholicity of the Church 34

CHAPTER VI.

The Apostolicity of the Church 41

CHAPTER VII.

The Catholic Church proved to be the Church of Christ 47

CHAPTER VIII.

Catholics or Roman Catholics 57

CHAPTER IX.

The Continuity Theory 60

CHAPTER X.

Anglican Orders 62

CHAPTER XI.

The Infallibility of the Church 65

CHAPTER XII.

Papal Infallibility 69

PAGE

CHAPTER XIII.

The Supremacy of St. Peter proved from Scripture ... 75

CHAPTER XIV.

St. Peter's Supremacy passed to his Successors ... 83

CHAPTER XV.

Examples of Papal Supremacy in England ... 87

CHAPTER XVI.

Was St. Peter in Rome 91

CHAPTER XVII.

The Temporal Power of the Pope 94

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Word of God—Sacred Scripture... 96

CHAPTER XIX.

The Word of God—Divine Tradition 101

CHAPTER XX.

The Veneration of Saints 107

CHAPTER XXI.

The Intercession of Saints 111

CHAPTER XXII.

The Invocation of Saints 113

CHAPTER XXIII.

Relics 116

CHAPTER XXIV.

Images 120

CHAPTER XXV.

Indulgences 124

CHAPTER XXVI.

Purgatory... 131

CHAPTER XXVII.

Devotion to the Blessed Virgin 139

PAGE

CHAPTER XXVIII.

The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin ... 143

CHAPTER XXIX.

Penance 148

CHAPTER XXX.

The Eucharist 156

CHAPTER XXXI.

The Sacrifice of the Mass 161

CHAPTER XXXII.

The Priesthood 167

CHAPTER XXXIII.

Monks and Nuns 169

CHAPTER XXXIV.

Ceremonies 173

CHAPTER XXXV.

Religious Persecution 175

CHAPTER XXXVI.

Prayers and Instructions 184

CATHOLIC DOCTRINES EXPLAINED AND PROVED.

CHAPTER I.

Considerations for the Reader.

Proofs for the Existence of God.

The metaphysical proof: Look at the whole world, there is nothing in it which necessarily exists, any thing you take up, may or may not be without the slightest repugnance. It follows then that the world is not able to account for itself, or for its existence. Hence we must seek the reason of its existence outside of itself. Therefore God exists. This argument in other words would run thus: There are certain effects which we notice in the world around us. These effects must have their causes, for nothing comes into existence of itself and there must be a primary cause for all things; which can be no other than God.

The physical proof: There is a wonderful disposition of parts to an end noticeable in the material world. Now matter is not endowed with intelligence hence we infer that this wonderful arrangement of parts towards special ends is the work of some intelligence outside of matter. He who brought about all this harmony must be infinite. He must be God. An example will help us to see the force of this argument. Let us take the mechanism of a watch. There you have the adaptation of parts in order

to move the index hand. All this is due not to the metal of which the watch is composed but to the intelligence of the watchmaker. Take another example in a book: all the letters, and the arrangement of the letters to make the words could not happen by chance, it is the work of an intelligent mind. Now there are far more wonderful things in the world around us, and they are so wonderful that nothing but an infinite intelligence can account for the harmony which exists between them. Could all the men in the world, with the greatest intellects the world ever saw directing their movements, add another to the number of the stars? Could they stop the succession of day and night? or if we fancy that such a succession ceased to exist should we be so foolish as to think that men could of themselves establish it again? Study the heavens, the motion of the sun, and the moon, and the stars; all goes on with the greatest harmony; study the earth and the ocean, with the succession of seasons and the flow and ebb of the tide; and you will find that it is only an infinitely intelligent Power who could bring about and continue to preserve this wonderful harmony.

The same argument in a few words is this: There is wonderful order and harmony in the universe. This must be the work of some intelligent being, who must be infinite, because no other could accomplish these stupendous works.

The moral proof: Each one feels in his own conscience a sense of right and wrong. Why so? Is it not because nature itself tells him that he is a responsible agent, and if so, to whom can he be responsible? certainly not to himself, nor to mere human nature for that is but a part of his own self, and consequently he cannot be responsible to it. Then he must be bound by some authority outside human nature, and that authority can be nothing less than the Supreme Lawgiver, who is God.

In other words the argument is: All nations are in full agreement about the existence of a Supreme Being. Some cause must be assigned for this universal belief. The cause for this belief is either the Revelation of God

Himself, or tradition from our first parents. This belief in one great Supreme Being prevails not only among intelligent nations but also amongst the most barbarous.

So far we have not had recourse to Revelation to prove the existence of God. The Psalmist assures us that we can see God in His works. "The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of His hands" (Psalm xviii).

St. Paul in his condemnation of the Roman philosophers clearly shows that they could have known God by the very light of reason. "Because that which is known of God is manifest in them. For God had manifested it to them. For the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made: His eternal power also and divinity: so that they are inexcusable. Because that when they knew God, they have not glorified Him as God, or given thanks, but became vain in their thoughts, and their foolish hearts were darkened. For professing themselves wise they became fools. And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of creeping things. Wherefore God gave them up to the desires of their heart. . . . Who changed the truth of God into a lie: and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. For this cause God delivered them up to shameful affections. . . . And as they liked not to have God in their knowledge; God delivered them up to a reprobate sense" (Romans i. 19-28). Here St. Paul plainly says that these philosophers could have known God but that they would not. They gave themselves up to shameful sins, and as a punishment for these became hardened in their hearts and darkened in their intellects

The Providence of God.

We should always remember that we are God's children, "He made us and not we ourselves." We are only

sojourners here upon the earth, it is for us only a place of exile, our true country is beyond the grave, we are here on trial having one great object set before us, viz., to save our immortal souls. For the attaining of this great object God will give us every assistance. He even provides for our daily wants. "The eyes of all hope in thee" says the Psalmist, "and thou givest them meat in due season thou openest thy hand and fillest with blessing every living creature."

God is continually watching over us. "He made the great and the little and He hath equal care of all." Nothing is more certain than that the providence of God is directing and protecting us; holy Job says that "God provideth food for the raven when her young ones cry to God wandering about because they have no meat."

We should remember then that we are God's children that He is a great and bountiful Master, and we should return Him thanks for His watchful care over us.

The following passage will give us an idea of the Creator, "Contemplate the Supreme Being, the Being of beings; fix the idea of Him in your minds. He is one; He has no rival; He has no equal; He is unlike anything else; He is Sovereign; He can do what He will. He is unchangeable from first to last; He is all perfect; He is infinite in His power and His wisdom, or He could not have made this immense world which we see by day and by night.

"And since He is everlasting and has created all things from a certain beginning, it follows that He has lived in an eternity before He began to create anything. What a wonderful thought is this! there was a state of things in which God was by Himself, and nothing else but He. There was no earth, no sky, no sun, no stars, no space, no time, no beings of any kind; no men, no angels, no Seraphim. His throne was without ministers; He was not waited on by any; all was silence, all was repose, there was nothing but God; and this state continued not for a while only, but for a measureless duration; it was a state which had ever been; it was the rule of things and creation had been an innovation upon it.

Creation is, comparatively speaking, but of yesterday; it has lasted a poor six thousand years, say sixty thousand, if you will, or six million, or six million million, what is this to eternity? nothing at all; not so much as a drop compared to the whole ocean, or a grain of sand to the whole earth. I say through a whole eternity God was by Himself, with no other being but Himself; with nothing external to Himself, not working, but at rest, not speaking, not receiving homage from any, not glorified in creatures, but blessed in Himself, and by Himself, and wanting nothing. What an idea this gives us of the Almighty! He is above us, we feel He is; how little we can understand Him!" (Cardinal Newman.)

The Shortness of Life.

We shall say a few words about the great eternal truths in order to bring to our minds the issues that are at stake. We shall first consider the shortness of life. Man's life is short. Job says:—"Man born of woman living for a short time is filled with many miseries, he cometh forth like a flower; and flieth like a shadow." And the prophet Isaias says;—"All flesh is like to grass, man's glory and splendour is like the flower of the fields, which is exposed to the burning rays of the sun and to rain and wind." And St. Paul says:—"Life is short, therefore let those who weep, hold themselves as if they had no sorrow, let those that have riches be as if they had nothing, for these things are of short duration."

If life then is so short it is important for us to make good use of the time that God gives us, lest when the day of reckoning shall come, God should be compelled to say to us as He said to the vineyard which He fenced in, and planted with the choicest vines but which nevertheless produced no fruit, or at least did not produce what was expected from it: "I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be wasted, I will break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down, and I will make it desolate, hell hath opened its mouth without bounds, and their strong ones and their high and glorious ones shall go down into it" (Isaias).

Death.

St. Paul tells us that it is appointed to men once to die and after death the judgment. Death is the separation of the soul from the body. It is the settling of our state for eternity for "as the tree falls so shall it lie." If we miss our object in life, if we lose our souls we shall never get a second chance.

Death is certain. We must all die. The decree is already passed. It would be madness in the extreme for anyone to think that he shall escape death. The greatest and the most renowned princes, and kings, and emperors have died, and there shall be no exception in our case.

The certainty of death is brought home to us every day of our lives. We are constantly seeing deaths and funerals. Visit the monuments of the dead and from their silent tombs they will admonish you of what the Scripture says:—"Remember my judgment for thine also shall be so, yesterday for me, and to-day for thee."

Neither riches nor dignity will be able to exempt us from death. We are brought into the world for a short time and we are continually reminded that this earth is not our resting place.

Since then death is certain and since it is a moment that is all important for each one of us, we ought to prepare ourselves for it, and the time of life is the time that is given us for this preparation. We often pray for the grace of a happy death; to lead good lives is the best guarantee of a good death. St. Augustine says:—that "a late repentance is seldom true or sincere; men generally die as they live, their death is of a piece with their life; as the tree is so shall be the fruit."

Judgment.

And after Death the Judgment. Each one of us shall be judged immediately after death, and his fate for eternity shall be decided according to his good or bad works. In addition to that particular judgment there

shall be a general judgment at the last day in order to manifest the power of Christ, and to justify before men the ways of God's providence. Nothing can be conceived more terrible than the signs which shall precede the last judgment. The sun shall be darkened, the moon shall refuse to give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven. The rivers shall burst their banks, the sea shall foam with fury, the earth shall tremble and all nature shall be in a state of confusion,

The Sacred Scripture gives us a dreadful picture of what shall take place. St. Matthew says:—"When therefore you shall see the abomination of desolation which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet standing in the holy place: he that readeth, let him understand . . . for there shall be then great tribulation such as hath not been from the beginning of the world until now, neither shall be. . . . For as lightning cometh out of the east and appeareth into the west so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. . . . And immediately after the tribulation of those days, the sun shall be darkened and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven and the powers of the heavens shall be moved, and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and He shall send His angels with a trumpet, and a great voice, and they shall gather together His elect, from the four winds, from the farthest parts of the heavens to their utmost bounds" (St. Matt. xxiv).

St. Luke says:—"There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars, and upon the earth distress of nations" (St. Luke xxi). And St. Peter says:—"The day of the Lord shall come as a thief in the night, in which the heavens shall pass away with a rushing noise, and the heavenly bodies shall be scorched up, and dissolved, the earth also and the works therein shall be burnt up."

Contemplate the sentiments of the wicked and the just on that day. How different shall they be! Contemplate also the expiring of this sinful world, the resurrection of the dead, and the assembling of all the children of Adam.

See Christ appearing with the standard of the Cross before Him, and surrounded by His heavenly legions of angelic spirits. Witness the opening and closing of the books, and hear the sentence of the bad and the good.

Each of us shall one day pass through this terrible scene. The question, the all important question is, shall we be at the right hand or the left hand of Christ. Now is the time to decide, "before man is life and death, good and evil that which he shall choose shall be given to him."

Eternity.

After death and judgment our destiny will be settled for eternity. If we die a happy death the glories of heaven shall be ours. If we die a bad death God in His justice will condemn us to everlasting punishment.

We will consider the punishment reserved for the wicked because it is well calculated to bring home to us the great issue that is at stake. Hell is a prison where the damned are confined, and separated from all the comforts of life. It is a prison that is loathsome and full of every misery. No sun, no moon, no stars, not even a glimpse of light ever appears in that gloomy region; nothing but sorrow, and darkness, and the company of all the demons in an ocean of fire rolling mountains high. Job says: that "it is a land from which there is no coming back, a land that is dark, and covered with the obscurity of death, a land of misery and darkness, where the shadow of death and no order but everlasting horror dwelleth:" and Isaias says:—"The nourishment thereof is fire, and the breath of the Lord as a torrent of brimstone kindling it."

Such is the picture given us in the Old Testament of this dread abode, but the descriptions in the New Testament are no less terrible. St. Matthew says, it is a furnace of fire where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, and exterior darkness, and eternal fire, and everlasting punishments. And St. Mark says, it is a place where the worm dieth not and the fire is

not extinguished, for in the hell of unquenchable fire, everyone shall be salted with fire, and every victim shall be salted with salt (St. Mark ix.).

The following beautiful passage from Thomas à Kempis will fill us with the thought of eternity. "Eternity! what shall man, the being of a day, say of thee; how shall he say it and who shall comprehend what he shall say? Eternity:—O, thy length and thy depth! how immense and how infinite in thy blessings and thy woes! thou monarch of all ages! thou endless, and ever existing Eternity!

"Eternity!—Conceive O mortal if thou canst, a thousand years, a hundred thousand years, a hundred millions of times a thousand years—as many millions of times a thousand years as there are leaves on the trees of the forest, blades of grass in the fields, grains of sand upon the sea shore, drops of water in the ocean, atoms in the air, and stars in the firmament—and thou shalt not yet have begun to fathom thee, O Eternity, or to tell the measure of thy years! The day will come when the sun will cease to shine, when the world shall have been consumed, the human race extinct, the dead judged, age shall have succeeded age in countless succession since the brief hour of man's earthly being; life will appear but as a speck in the vast distance—like the stars in the immensity of space, or as a long-vanished dream—and still it will be and ever will be Eternity!

"Eternity! If heaven throughout thine everlasting years be ours, O happiness incomprehensible! truth and virtue ever-enduring; immortal life, and all its delights, with the angels and the blessed; God to contemplate, love, possess, and bless for ever; and sorrow, sin and death never more.

"Eternity!—But if hell in thee be ours, O woe unutterable!—sin ever defiling; darkness overwhelming; the worm that never dieth, ever gnawing; the fire of despair that is never quenched, ever-burning; unavailing tears ever flowing! the lost ever blaspheming; demons ever tormenting; and the soul separated from God for ever. With never a ray of hope to rejoice, a friendly word to

console, a moment of sleep to revive; nor God to behold for ever!

"Mortal, there is an eternity! and art thou mindful of it? It is for thee; thou art on the brink of this dreadful Eternity, and dost thou heed it? Of all the pleasures which now beguile thee: of all the pursuits that now occupy thee; of this fleeting life that dazzles and deludes thee, shortly nothing will remain but Eternity—Eternity and thy works and their reward. In Eternity the pleasures of the sinner shall have perished, but his punishment shall remain; in it the sorrows of the righteous shall have passed away, but his crown of glory shall endure. Choose now, therefore, which thou wilt have—the passing pleasures of time with the pains of Eternity, or the short sufferings of the present life with their everlasting reward. O Eternity, Eternity, may'st thou be mine in heaven with God" (Thomas à Kempis).

The Practice of Religion.

Religion may be said to be the true service of God. We are God's creatures and therefore we ought to acknowledge His dominion over us, and our dependence on Him.

The best means by which this can be done is the practice of religion. Without religion we cannot be pleasing to God, for since God exists and is our Creator we are bound to honour Him. It is our duty to practise the truths which He has taught us. Every one admits that a child ought to obey and honour its parents. Now we are God's children, He is the very cause of our existence, we are therefore bound to obey Him and to worship Him.

Man owes everything he has to God. "God made us and not we ourselves." We see then that men are bound to practise religion, but it might be asked is a man free to practise any form of religion which he wishes? We say no. We must do what Christ has told us rather than what pleases our own fancy. Christ

established one and only one religion and we must practise that, because other forms must be false and consequently dishonour God instead of pleasing Him. Our Divine Lord could not establish different systems of religion contradicting each other, for this would be to make him the author of error. Christ preached His doctrine to the people. His disciples flocked around Him, and out of these He selected Apostles who were to continue His work. You cannot fancy these Apostles teaching contradictions. Contradiction involves error. Now God loves truth, and two religions which contradict each other cannot be true. Therefore there can be only one true religion. We shall now proceed to show that Christ established one and only one Church. We shall see what are its marks and its endowments, we shall explain its doctrines, and prove them from Reason, Scripture and Tradition.

CHAPTER II.

The Establishment of the Church.

We all admit that Christ established one, and only one Church. Protestants admit this with us, for if you ask them whether Christ established all these different sects which now exist? they answer and say that He did not and that He could not. Christ established, they say, only one Church and the difficulty is to find out which Church is the Church of Christ. You say yours is, and I say mine is, every one as they were brought up to believe.

This is a common feeling among Protestants and it is only those who do not care about truth in the practice of religion, that say that there is not some one true Church.

Looking over the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of St. Paul, we are forcibly struck by the importance given to the Church, which from the descriptions given was evidently to be a visible body. It should be visible because nothing else could answer the descriptions given of it in Scripture, "A city seated on a mountain cannot be hid" (St. Matt. v. 14).

If the Church were invisible how could St. Paul admonish us "to hear the Church." Again St. Paul calls the Church "the pillar and the ground of Truth." The Church is in a sense invisible, e.g., in the working of grace through the Sacraments, prayer, &c. God alone can distinguish the effects which the sacraments produce in different souls.

"And as in animals the vital principle is unseen and invisible, and is evidenced and manifested by the movements and actions of the members, so the principle of supernatural life in the Church is clearly shown in that which is done by it" (Encyclical Letter of Leo XIII. on the Unity of the Church).

The being a member of and acknowledging the visible Church is the means ordained by Our Divine Lord for participating in the invisible treasures of grace which the Church dispenses to her children "just as the vine gives nourishment and renders fruitful the branches united to it" (Leo XIII).

The Church is then a visible body invested with authority. This authority was exercised by the apostles and their successors. Our Lord selected them and gave them a commission to teach all nations and to bring these nations into the one fold. "Going therefore teach ye all natious: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (St. Matt. xxviii. 19). The Church is a visible society with a regularly appointed government.

We do not find Christ insisting that each one is to

gave them power over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of diseases and all manner of infirmities. And the names of the twelve Apostles are these: The first Simon who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother. James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas and Matthew the publican, and James the son of Alpheus, and Thaddeus: Simon the Cananean, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed Him. These twelve Jesus sent: commanding them, saying: Go ye not into the way of the Gentiles, and into the cities of the Samaritans enter ye not: But go ye rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And going preach, saying: The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils: freely have you received, freely give. Do not possess gold, nor silver, nor money in your purses: Nor scrip for your journey, nor two coats, nor shoes, nor a staff; for the workman is worthy of his meat. And into whatsoever city or town you shall enter, inquire who in it is worthy, and there abide till you go thence. And when you come into the house, salute it, saying: Peace be to this house. And if that house be worthy, your peace shall come upon it; but if it be not worthy, your peace shall return to you. And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words: going forth out of that house or city shake off the dust from your feet. Amen I say to you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city. Behold I send you as sheep in the midst of wolves. Be ye therefore wise as serpents and simple as doves. But beware of men. For they will deliver you up in councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues. And you shall be brought before governors, and before kings for my sake, for a testimony to them and to the Gentiles. But when they shall deliver you up, take no thought how or what to speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what to speak" (St. Matt. x. 1-19).

"Jesus said to them: But whom do you say that I am? Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art Christ

the Son of the living God. And Jesus answering said to him. Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee: That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: And whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven" (St. Matt. xvi. 15-19).

"And if he will not hear them, tell the Church. And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican. Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven" (St. Matt. xviii. 17-18).

"And Jesus coming spoke to them, saying: All power is given to Me in heaven and in earth. Going therefore teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: And behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (St. Matt. xxviii. 18-20).

Passages from St. Mark.

"And after that John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying: the time is accomplished, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent, and believe the gospel. And passing by the sea of Galilee, He saw Simon and Andrew his brother, casting nets into the sea (for they were fishermen). And Jesus said to them: Come after Me, and I will make you to become fishers of men. And immediately leaving their nets, they followed Him. And going from thence a little farther, He saw James the Son of Zebedee, and John his brother, who also were mending their nets in the ship: And forthwith He called them. And leaving their father

Zebedee in the ship with his hired men, they followed him" (St. Mark i. 14-20).

"And He went forth again to the seaside: and all the multitude came to Him, and He taught them. And when He was passing by, He saw Levi the Son of Alpheus, sitting at the receipt of custom; and He saith to him; Follow Me. And rising up he followed Him" (St. Mark ii. 13-14).

"And going up into a mountain, He called unto Him whom He would Himself: And they came to Him. And He made that twelve should be with Him, and that He might send them to preach. And He gave them power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils. And to Simon He gave the name Peter. And James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James: and He named them Boanerges, which is, the sons of thunder. And Andrew and Philip, and Bartholomew and Matthew, and Thomas and James of Alpheus, and Thaddeus, and Simon the Cananean. And Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed Him. And they come to a house, and the multitude cometh together again, so that they could not so much as eat bread" (St. Mark iii. 13-20).

"And He called the twelve; and began to send them two and two, and gave them power over unclean spirits. And He commanded them that they should take nothing for the way, but a staff only: no scrip, no bread, nor money in their purse. But to be shod with sandals, and that they should not put on two coats. And He said to them: Wheresoever you shall enter into an house, there abide till you depart from that place. And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you; going forth from thence, shake off the dust from your feet for a testimony to them. And going forth they preached that men should do penance. And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them. And king Herod heard (for His name was made manifest), and he said: John the Baptist is risen again from the dead, and therefore mighty works show forth themselves in Him (St. Mark vi. 7-14).

"And He said to them: Go ye into the whole world

and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not, shall be condemned. And these signs shall follow them that believe: In My name they shall cast out devils: they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents: and if they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them: they shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall recover. And the Lord Jesus, after He had spoken to them, was taken up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God. But they going forth preached everywhere; the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed" (St. Mark xvi. 15-20).

Passages from St. Luke.

"And when day was come, He called unto Him His disciples; and He chose twelve of them (whom also He named apostles); Simon, whom He surnamed Peter, and Andrew his brother, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas, James the son of Alpheus, and Simon who is called Zelotes, and Jude the brother of James, and Judas Iscariot who was the traitor. And coming down with them, He stood in a plain place, and the company of His disciples, and a very great multitude of people from all Judea and Jerusalem, and the sea-coast both of Tyre and Sidon" (St. Luke vi. 13-17).

"Then calling together the twelve apostles, He gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases. And He sent them to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick. And He said to them: Take nothing for your journey, neither staff, nor scrip, nor bread, nor money, neither have two coats. And whatsoever house you shall enter into, abide there, and depart not from thence. And whosoever shall not receive you, when ye go out of that city, shake off even the dust of your feet for a testimony against them. And going out they went about through the town, preaching the gospel and healing everywhere" (St. Luke ix. 1-6).

And after these things the Lord appointed also other

seventy-two: and He sent them two and two before His face into every city and place whither He Himself was to come. And He said to them: The harvest indeed is great, but the labourers are few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He send labourers into His harvest. Go: Behold I send you as lambs among wolves, Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes: and salute no man by the way. Into whatsoever house you enter, first say: Peace be to this house. And if the Son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon Him: but if not, it shall return to you. And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they have. For the labourer is worthy of his hire. Remove not from house to house. And into what city soever you enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you: and heal the sick that are therein, and say to them: The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. But into whatsoever city you enter, and they receive you not, going forth into the streets, thereof, say: Even the very dust of your city that cleaveth to us we wipe off against you. Yet know this that the kingdom of God is at hand. I say to you, it shall be more tolerable at that day for Sodom, than for that city. Woe to thee, Corozain, woe to thee Bethsaida. For if in Tyre and Sidon had been wrought the mighty works that have been wrought in you, they would have done penance long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the judgment, than for you. And thou, Capharnaum, which art exalted unto heaven: thou shalt be thrust down to hell. He that heareth you, heareth Me: and he that despiseth you despiseth Me. And he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me. And the seventy-two returned with joy, saying: Lord, the devils also are subject to us in Thy name. And He said to them: I saw Satan like lighting falling from heaven: Behold, I have given you power to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and upon all the power of the enemy, and nothing shall hurt you. But yet rejoice not in this that spirits are subject unto you: but rejoice in this, that your names are written in heaven (St. Luke x. 1-20).

Passages from St. John.

"He said therefore to them again: Peace be to you As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you. When He had said this, He breathed on them; and He said to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them: and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained" (St. John xx. 21-23).

"When therefore they had dined, Jesus said to Simon Peter: Simon son of John, lovest thou Me, more than these? He saith to Him: Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith to him: Feed My lambs. He saith to him again: Simon son of John, lovest thou Me? He saith to Him: Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith to him: Feed My lambs. He said to him the third time: Simon son of John, lovest thou Me? Peter was grieved, because He had said to him the third time, lovest thou Me? And he said to Him: Lord, thou knowest all things: Thou knowest that I love Thee. He said to him: Feed My sheep" (St. John xxi. 15-17).

Passages from the Acts of the Apostles.

"In those days Peter rising up in the midst of the brethren, said: (now the number of persons together was about an hundred and twenty). Men brethren, the scripture must needs be fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost spoke before by the mouth of David concerning Judas, who was the leader of them that apprehended Jesus. Who was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry. And he indeed hath possessed a field of the reward of iniquity, and being hanged, burst asunder in the midst; and all his bowels gushed out. And it became known to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem: so that the same field was called in their tongue, Haceldama, that is to say, the field of blood. For it is written in the book of psalms: Let their habitation become desolate, and let there be none to dwell therein. And his bishopric let another take. Wherefore of these men who have companied with us, all the time that the

Lord Jesus came in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John until the day wherein He was taken up from us, one of them must be made a witness with us of His resurrection. And they appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias. And praying they said: Thou Lord Who knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two Thou hast chosen to take the place of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas hath by transgression fallen, that he might go to his own place. And they gave them lots and the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven apostles" (Acts 1. 15-26).

"And when the days of Pentecost were accomplished, they were all in one place together; and suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a mighty wind coming, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. And there appeared to them parted tongues as it were of fire, and it sat upon every one of them: And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they began to speak with divers tongues, according as the Holy Ghost gave them to speak. Now there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men out of every nation under heaven. And when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together and were confounded in mind, because that every man heard them speak in his own tongue. And they were all amazed, and wondered, saying: Behold are not all these that speak, Galileans? And how have we heard, every man our own tongue wherein we were born? Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and inhabitants of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphilia, Egypt, and the parts of Lybia about Cyrene and strangers of Rome. Jews also, and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians: we have heard them speak in our own tongue the wonderful works of God. And they were all astonished and wondered, saying one to another: What meaneth this? But others mocking said: These men are full of new wine. But Peter standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice, and spoke to them: Ye men of Judea, and all you that dwell in Jerusalem, be

this known to you, and with your ears receive my words" (Acts ii. 1-14).

"And they were persevering in the doctrines of the Apostles, and in the communication of breaking bread, and in prayers. And fear came upon every soul: many wonders also and signs were done by the Apostles in Jerusalem, and there was great fear in all. And all they that believed, were together, and had all things in common. Their possessions and goods, they sold, and divided them to all, according as everyone had need. And continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, they took their meat with gladness and simplicity of heart. Praising God and having favour with all the people. And the Lord increased daily together such as should be saved" (Acts ii. 42-47).

"And as they were speaking to the people, the priests and the officer of the temple and the Sadducees came upon them. Being grieved that they taught the people, and preached in Jesus the resurrection from the dead: And they laid hands upon them, and put them in hold till the next day: for it was now evening. But many of them, who had heard the word, believed: and the number of the men was made five thousand" (Acts iv. 1-4).

They therefore that were dispersed, went about preaching the word of God. And Philip going down to the city of Samaria, preached Christ unto them. And the people with one accord were attentive to those things which were said by Philip, hearing, and seeing the miracles which he did (Acts viii. 4-6).

Passages from St. Paul.

"Built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief-corner stone. In whom all the building, being framed together, groweth up into an holy temple in the Lord. In whom ye also are built together into an habitation of God in the Spirit" (Ephes. ii. 20-22).

"I therefore, a prisoner in the Lord, beseech you that

you walk worthy of the vocation in which you are called. With all humility and mildness, with patience, supporting one another in charity, careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace One body and one Spirit: as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all" (Ephes, iv. 1-6).

"Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you: but that you be perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment" (1 Cor i. 10).

"For as many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew, nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free: there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus. And if you be Christ's; then you are the seed of Abraham, heirs according to the promise" (Gal. iii. 27-29).

The Establishment of the Church.

Looking over these passages it is evident that the Church spoken of must be visible, must have unity, must embrace all nations under heaven, it was not to be national or local; and it must have Apostolical Succession, and must last to the end of time. The Catholic Church alone has all these notes and therefore it is the one Church of Christ. In the next chapters we shall prove that the Catholic Church has each and all of these notes.

CHAPTER III.

The Unity of the Church.

The true Church of God must have certain marks by which it can be known and distinguished from false sects. A mark or note is something which is more discernible than is that of which it is a note; it is the means of our acquiring the knowledge of a thing, it is a way by which we arrive at a knowledge of the truth, it is a motive of credibility.

Whatever Church is the true Church it must have unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolical succession. If you see a Church having these four marks you can put your finger on it and say that this is the Church of God, and if you see a Church without any one of these four marks you can say at once that it is not the Church of Christ.

The first and most important mark of the true Church is unity which we shall now treat at some length. Catholics at the present day have the same faith as had the early Christians and martyrs. They believe the same truths, they receive the same sacraments, and they offer up the same sacrifice. The government of the Church is the same now as it was then, all acknowledging the same visible head the Vicar of Christ; in every parish the faithful were subject to their priests, the priests were subject to the bishops, and the bishops were subject to the Pope who is the head of all the faithful.

The faith of Catholics here in England is the same as the faith of Catholics in Ireland, America Australia, France, Germany, India, Africa, &c. The doctrine of Catholics at the present day is the same as that which St. Augustine preached in England in the sixth century and the same as St. Peter and St. Paul preached in the cities which they evangelized.

It is the same to-day as it was 1800 years ago and the same as it was in every succeeding age, during all the centuries which have passed since the establishment of

the Church. She has preached the same doctrines in all lands and at all times, "Jesus Christ yesterday and to-day and the same for ever."

She did not change her dogmas to suit the prejudices of some nations or to pander to the passions of men in times of great social changes when their wickedness might have brought morality to a low state. During every age and in every state of society she remained as unchanged and as immovable with respect to her dogmas as the rock on which she is built, although she was ever ready to adapt her discipline to the needs of every age.

Different nations, which differ from each other in race, colour, language, and national interests, and in everything which in the natural order of things would tend to cause separation and difference of belief, are found in the Catholic Church, all believing the same truths, partaking of the same sacraments, and are united under one visible head on earth.

The Catholic Church unites the present with the distant past, and unites in the bonds of faith nations separated from each other by mighty oceans. How marvellous it is to contemplate over 250 millions of men of all nations united in the same faith and those again united with all the generations which have gone before them. Take a Catholic in any part of the world and question him about the doctrines of his faith and in that one man you will find the one faith of 250 millions of people.

Travel into any part of the known world where there is a Catholic Church, and there you would find the same sacrifice offered up, and the same sacraments administered, and the same authority acknowledged.

Contrast this state of things with the sects which have men for their founders, and in most cases only a single country for their home, with almost as many divisions as there are individuals, and you will have a fitting subject for thoughtful meditation. Every shade of opinion in things great as well as small is tolerated in these sects, their

members believe what they like, and reject what they like; each one according to his own fancy; every-one is a law unto himself.

In the natural order of things these sects have all the helps which would enable them to preserve unity, and they have failed. They are generally of one race and nation, speaking the same language, have the same national interests, and are backed up by the power of the state, and still with all these advantages they have signally failed to preserve unity. We shall now proceed to our subject and show that unity is a mark of the true Church. Unity must be a mark of the Church of Christ because if there is not unity there is contradiction, and wherever there is contradiction there is error which is hateful in the sight of God.

What Catholics understand by unity is that (1) all the faithful are united in the profession of the same faith (2) in the use of the same sacraments and sacrifice (3) and are governed by the same visible head.

(1) All the members of the Church must profess the same doctrine, viz., the doctrine of Christ and His Apostles. Now that teaching must be the same on every point, because we cannot suppose our Divine Lord teaching one thing now and its contradiction at another time, neither can we suppose that the Apostles taught doctrines which were at variance with each other. "Go ye therefore teach all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." He tells them to teach "all nations" and to teach them "all things" which He commanded them. He does not tell them to confine their labours to one or two nations, and He does not tell them to enforce some doctrines and to leave people free to accept or reject others at their pleasure, neither does He tell them to invent new doctrines of their own fancy and to teach these to the world.

(2) In the second place all true Christians must partake of the same sacraments. Our Divine Lord instituted sacraments as so many fountains and channels

of grace by which the merits of His Passion and sufferings might be applied to our souls. As He did not institute different sacraments for different sets of men it follows that all Christians must partake of the same sacraments. Our relation to these sacraments is sometimes compared to the people of a town where there is only one fountain of water from which all the people can get a plentiful supply of water for their wants. It is there for all, those who draw it are refreshed, but if there are some so foolish as not to have recourse to that fountain they soon perish of thirst. Christ purchased innumerable and priceless graces for man, and the sacraments are the channels by which they are applied to our souls. If some do not have recourse to them their souls will perish for want of spiritual food.

(3) As the Church of Christ is a society it must have a head because there must be a head to every society, and no society can exist without some head as a centre of authority. In the Church there are pastors and governors and there is a chief pastor over all. Our Divine Lord often speaks of His Apostles as shepherds and of the people as sheep. Now it would not do to have shepherds who should be at variance one with another; such a state of things could not long endure, for every kingdom divided against itself shall fall.

We shall now put before our readers passages from the New Testament which show in the most clear manner that Christ intended that His Church should be one.

The Unity of the Church proved from the Bible.

"And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word, shall believe in Me. That they may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee: that they also may be one in Us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the glory which Thou hast given to Me, I have given to them: that they may be one, as We also are one. I in

them, and Thou in Me: that they may be made perfect in one" (St. John xvii. 20-30). "And other sheep I have, that are not of this fold: them also I must bring and they shall hear My voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd" (St. John x. 16). "If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, nor say to him, God speed you" (2 St. John i. 10).

"For as in one body we have many members, but all the members have not the same office. So we being many, are one body in Christ; and every one members one of another" (Romans xii. 4. 5).

"Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one spirit: as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all" (Eph. iv. 3-6).

"But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema. And as we said before, so now I say again: If anyone preach to you a gospel, besides that which you have received, let him be anathema" (Gal. i. 8. 9).

"Now I beseech you, brethren by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you: but that you be perfect in the same mind and in the same judgment" (1 Cor. 10).

The necessity for unity in the Church is also seen from the passages where the sacred writers speak of the evils arising from heresy and schism. "A man that is a heretic; after the first and second admonition avoid: knowing that he, that is such a one, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned by his own judgment" (Titus iii. 10).

"But there were also false prophets among the people, even as there shall be among you lying teachers who shall bring in sects of perdition, and deny the Lord who bought them: bringing upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their riot-

ousness, through whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken" (2 St. Peter ii 1-2).

"Be followers of me, brethren, and observe them who walk so as you have our model. For many walk, of whom I have told you (and now tell you weeping) that they are the enemies of the Cross of Christ whose end is destruction: whose God is their belly: and whose glory is their shame: who mind earthly things" (Phil. iii. 17-19). And our Divine Lord Himself tells us to beware of false prophets, who shall come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. They are blind leaders of the blind, &c. All these passages show that Christ and his Apostles taught one and the same doctrine and that it was wrong and sinful in the extreme to depart from it. What could symbolize unity better than the figures of a kingdom, a sheep-fold, a vine, &c., and these are the symbols which Christ has made use of in describing His Church.

The Fathers of the Church insist in the strongest possible manner on the necessity of unity. We shall now put before our readers a few extracts from their writings, and shall take most of them from the Pope's Letter on the "Unity of the Church," so that we may be certain of their being correct.

The Unity of the Church proved from the Writings of the Fathers.

St. Chrysostom writes:—"Secede not from the Church, for nothing is stronger than the Church. Thy hope is the Church; thy salvation is the Church; thy refuge is the Church. It is higher than the heavens and wider than the earth. It never grows old but is ever full of vigour."

St. Clemens Alexandrinus writes:—"The eminence of the Church arises from its unity, as the principle of its constitution—a unity surpassing all else, and having nothing like it or equal to it."

St. Cyprian says:—"There is one God, and one Christ; and His Church is one and the faith is one;

and one the people, joined together in the solid unity of the body in the bond of concord. This unity cannot be broken, nor the one body divided by the separation of its constituent parts."

St. Augustine writes:—"So a Christian is a Catholic as long as he lives in the body: cut off from it he becomes a heretic—the life of the spirit follows not the amputated member." Again he writes:—This is the Holy Church—the one Church, the Catholic Church—the true Church, which contending against all heresies may herself be assailed, but cannot be overcome."

St. Ambrose says—"As all are called to unity, we should differ in nothing. For if there be one Lord, that is, one Christ; one faith and one baptism, one God and Father of all, the mind also should be one, and the heart of the people one, since all the things that he enumerates, are examples of unity, for they agree in all things" (Comment in Cap. iv. Ep. ad. Ephes).

St. Basil says "As many as hope in Christ are one people, and they who are of Christ, form one Church though it is named in many places."

Lactantius writes:—"The Catholic Church alone retains the true worship. This is the source of truth, this is the dwelling of faith, this is the temple of God, into which he that enters not, and from which he that goes out, forfeits the hope of life and eternal salvation."

Dionysius of Alexandria (A.D. 247) thus addresses the schismatic Novatian:—"You ought rather to have suffered all things than to have raised a schism in the Church. To die in defence of unity would be as glorious as laying down our life rather than sacrifice to idols, and in my opinion more glorious, because here the safety of the whole Church is consulted."

St. Cyprian writes:—"Whoever is separated from the Church is united to an adultress. He has cut himself off from the promises of the Church, and he who leaves the Church of Christ cannot arrive at the reward of Christ. . . . He who observes not this unity observes not the law of God, holds not the faith of the Father and the Son, clings not to life and salvation."

"The Church is one, widely extended by its fecundity; as there are many rays of light, but one sun; many branches of a tree, but one root deeply fixed; many streams of water, but one source. Take a ray from the sun; the unity of light follows not division. Break a branch from the tree, the branch cannot germinate. Cut off the stream from its source, the stream dries up. So the Church sends forth her rays over the whole earth, yet is the light one, and its unity is undivided" (St. Cyprian). "Who is so wicked and perfidious, who so transported by the rage of discord, as to think that the unity of God, the vesture of the Lord, the Church of Christ, may be severed? Christ tells us in His gospel, there shall be one flock, and one shepherd (John x. 16). Does anyone then imagine, that in the same place may be many shepherds and many flocks" (St. Cyprian).

These are only a few passages out of many which could be given from the early Fathers. They are sufficient to satisfy the most incredulous as to what was their feeling on this subject of unity.

CHAPTER IV.

The Sanctity of the Church.

We shall treat briefly the marks of Sanctity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity.

By holiness we understand that the Church teaches nothing but what is holy, that she proposes and enforces to her children the most powerful motives to become holy, and that she affords them the most efficacious means to be so, and that great numbers of her children, were and are remarkable for their sanctity in every age and nation.

The Catholic Church is holy because (1) of its founder

Jesus Christ who is the source of all sanctity, (2) because of its doctrines and sacraments, (3) because great numbers of her children have attained to eminent sanctity.

The mark of sanctity is essential to the true Church. St. Paul assures us that Christ died for this very purpose, to purify His Church and make her holy, "Christ also loved the Church, and delivered Himself up for it. That He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life. That He might present it to Himself a glorious Church not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing but that it should be holy and without blemish (St. Paul, Ephes. v. 25-27). And St. Peter says "You are a chosen generation, a holy nation, a purchased people."

When we say that the Church is holy we do not mean to say that all Catholics are holy. All ought to be holy, but some are bad, and they are bad because they do not live up to the teaching of the Catholic Church. This class of persons give great scandal, and they are more guilty before God than those who are outside the Church, because they know what is right and they do not do it.

The fact that there are sinners in the Church does not deprive it of the mark of sanctity. Our Divine Saviour came down from heaven to save sinners, and He himself tells us that there is more joy in heaven upon one sinner doing penance than for ninety-nine just. From the Gospels it is clear that there were to be good and bad in the Church. "The kingdom of heaven is likened to a man who sowed good seed in his field. But while men were asleep, his enemy came and oversowed cockle among the wheat, and went his way. And when the blade was sprung up, and had brought forth fruit, then appeared also the cockle. And the servants of the good man of the house, coming said to him: Sir, didst thou not sow good seed in thy field? Whence then hath it cockle? And he said to them; An enemy hath done this. And the servants said to him. Wilt thou that we go and gather it up? And he said: No, lest perhaps gathering up the cockle, you root up

the wheat also together with it. Suffer both to grow until the harvest, and in the time of the harvest I will say to the reapers. Gather up first the cockle, and bind it into bundles to burn, but the wheat gather ye into my barn" (St. Matt. xiii. 24-30).

"Again the kingdom of heaven is like to a net cast into the sea, and gathering together of all kind of fishes. Which when it was filled, they drew out, and sitting by the shore, they chose out the good into vessels, but the bad they cast forth. So shall it be at the end of the world. The angels shall go out, and shall separate the wicked from the just" (St. Matt. xiii. 24-30).

See also the parable of the ten virgins. By the fact that we are Christians we are supposed to be holy, because a Christian means a follower of Christ, "Be ye therefore perfect, as also your heavenly Father is perfect" (St. Matt, v. 48).

"Be ye therefore followers of God as most dear children" (Ephes, v. 1).

To say that the Church is not holy becaue there are some bad people in it, who are bad because they do not follow her commands, is much the same as to say that the just laws of this country are not good because there are some bad people who break them.

The Church is holy because of its founder Jesus Christ who was the source of all sanctity. The Psalmist says of Him "All the kings of the earth shall adore Him, all nations shall serve him. And speaking of the Church which he was to found, he says "The foundations thereof are holy."

The Church is holy by reason of its doctrine and its sacraments. Her teaching both in faith and morals inspires her children with a love of perfection, it teaches them to love virtue and to hate sin, and to observe faithfully the commandments of God. The sacraments are so many channels by which the merits of Christ's Passion are applied to our souls, and by which we are reconciled to God if we have fallen away from His grace.

The Catholic Church is holy because great numbers of her children in every age and nation have been remarkable for sanctity. Thousands and millions of them died for the faith, following close on the steps of their Divine Master.

She exhorts us to approach the Sacraments frequently, and to be present at the Holy Sacrifice whenever we have an opportunity. She admonishes us to watch and pray. She keeps before our minds the lives of the great saints and martyrs, who spent their lives in the service of God so that we may imitate their example. And above all she proposes for our imitation the life of our Divine Lord, "Leaving you an example that you should follow His steps" (1 St. Peter ii. 21).

The Church warns us against falling into sin, and if we have the misfortune and the misery to be in sin, she bids us get rid of it, and be reconciled again to God.

Thousands of holy virgins have left all and dedicated themselves to the service of God and their fellow creatures. Priests and bishops have lived lives of self-denial and spent themselves in the service of mankind that they might win souls to God. The Catholic Church has thus had grand results, to show that sanctity is one of her marks.

The mark of sanctity does not create much of an impression on the minds of non-Catholics in England and the reason no doubt is because they see numbers of our people living sinful lives, remaining away from Mass on Sunday, getting drunk, &c. Seeing this state of things existing among those who claim to have the one and only true faith, they say that "there are bad and good of all classes."

But non-Catholics should remember that there are thousands and millions in the Catholic Church who lead saintly lives, and that these people of whom we have spoken are bad because they are abusing the grace of God and are not living up to what their religion teaches them.

CHAPTER V.

The Catholicity of the Church.

The Catholicity of the Church is indirectly proved from what has been said in the beginning of the chapter on unity. Any Church which has not unity can never come to be universal.

The Church is Catholic or universal, because she has subsisted in every age, is spread through all nations and shall last to the end of time. The universality of the Church does not mean that she should have within her fold the majority of the human race, or the majority of Christians, or that she exists in every corner of the earth.

Universality in the sense in which it is an essential mark of the true Church implies that she should have within herself the power of extending herself to every part of the earth and of bringing all men under her sway.

The mark of universality means that the Catholic Church was not to be circumscribed in its extent. It was not to be the Church of one race or of one nation, nor was it to be the Church of one period of time. It was to be the Church of every age and nation.

This capacity of universality must be ever aggressive. It must not slumber but must be ever active.

In the beginning the Church of Christ was a small body. On the day of Pentecost they were a mere handful, confined to a single portion of the earth, confined in fact to a single city, still it was then the true Church just as much as it is now, and it was as Catholic and as universal as it is to-day, in so far as these are essential marks of its truth, because she had the power within herself of making herself universal. "Their sound hath gone forth into all the earth, and their words into the ends of the whole world" (Rom. x. 18. Psalm xviii. 5). Jesus Christ sent His Apostles to teach all nations and to teach them in every age until the

consummation of the world. In the beginning the faithful were not called Catholics, they were generally known by the name of Christians. But when heresies and schisms began to arise, there was necessity that those who retained the sound doctrine of the Apostles should be distinguished from those who fell into error. For this purpose the title of Catholic was adopted; the term is first found in the writings of St. Ignatius Bishop of Antioch, who was the successor of St. Peter in that See.

The word Catholic means universal. St. Augustine says:—"The Catholic Church is so called because it is spread throughout the world."

We are sometimes called Roman Catholics and the term if understood rightly is perfectly correct. It is wrong in a sense in which it is used by Protestants when they apply it to us. We shall explain this point at length later on. Catholic and Roman Catholic designate the same class of people, no one is a Catholic in the true sense of the word who is not also a Roman Catholic or in communion with the head of the Church, the centre of unity.

The Church is Catholic as regards place, time, and doctrine.

That the true Church was instituted by Christ to be diffused through all nations and propagated to the utmost bounds of the earth is manifest from many places in Sacred Scripture. In the twenty-eighth chapter of St. Matthew Christ says to His Apostles, "Go ye therefore teach all nations," and in the sixteenth chapter of St. Mark he says to them, "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned," and in another place He says, "you shall be witnesses to Me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and even to the uttermost parts of the earth," and the prophet Isaias foretelling the Catholicity of the Church says: "Thy gates shall be open continually, they shall not be shut day nor night that the strength of the Gentiles might be brought unto thee."

And the Royal Psalmist says:—"All the ends of the earth shall remember, and shall be converted to the Lord and all the kindreds of the Gentiles shall adore in His sight for the kingdom is the Lord's and He shall have dominion over the nations." And in the second Psalm we have, "Ask of me and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession."

You see then that the true Church is universal, that is, its jurisdiction extends to all nations; it is not territorial nor limited to a portion of the earth, but extends to all nations and forms one grand spiritual empire. "She is diffused," says St. Augustine, "by the splendour of one faith from the rising to the setting sun." She is unlike human republics, and unlike the religions of heretics which are frequently confined to one nation and are often even local.

The Catholic Church is spread throughout the world, and this can be said of no other religion. The Church of England is confined to England and a few of her possessions. The Church of Scotland is confined to Scotland, and so on of the other religions which were introduced by men, and are mere national and human institutions. How unlike all this is the Catholic Church with its members in every country in the world and all these bound together in the unity of the same faith.

The Church is Catholic as regards time, because it has existed in every age and will last till the end of time. "Behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world." It has existed in every age, and existed in spite of the most awful persecutions, and not only that, but it is guaranteed to exist till the end of time.

The Church is Catholic as regards doctrine, she has always taught sound doctrine, and she has always taught the same doctrine, because if she taught one doctrine in one age, and a different or contradictory doctrine in another age she could not be the true Church of God, because truth remains the same for ever.

It is close upon 1,900 years since Christ came to found His Church, and if the doctrines He taught the Apostles were true at that time, they were just as true 1,200 years later, and are just as true to-day. Truth never changes. The Church of to-day and of the future to be the true Church of Christ must be the Church of the past.

We are not Catholics exactly because our parents should happen to be Catholics, nor because we are of this or that nationality, but because we are members of that Church which alone can lay claim to Catholicity.

The Catholicity of the Church proved from the Fathers.

The following passages from the early Fathers will show forth the Catholicity of the Church better than anything we could write.

St. Irenaeus who wrote at the end of the second century says:—

"This faith and doctrine and tradition preached throughout the globe is as uniform as if the Church consisted of one family, possessing one soul and heart, and as if she had but one mouth. For though the languages of the world are dissimilar, her doctrine is the same.

"The Church founded in Germany, in the Celtic nations, in the East, in Egypt, in Lybia, and in the centres of civilization, do not differ from each other; but as the sun gives the same light throughout the world, so does the light of faith shine everywhere the same, and enlighten all men who wish to come to a knowledge of the truth."

Tertullian astonished at the rapid expansion of the Church says:—"We are but of yesterday and already have we filled your cities, towns, islands, your councils halls and camps . . . the palace, senate, forum: we have left you only the temples."

St. Ignatius says:—"Christ is where the Catholic Church is."

St. Pacianus says:—"Christian is my name, Catholic is my surname; by the former I am called, by the latter

I am distinguished. By the name of Catholic our society is distinguished from all heretics."

St. Augustine says:—"Many are the considerations which keep me in the Catholic Church—the assent of nations—her authority—first established by miracles—cherished by hope—extended by charity—strengthened by the lapse of years, the succession of pastors from the chair of Peter, to whom the Lord committed the care of feeding his flock, down to the present bishop; lastly the name itself of Catholic."

"We must hold fast to the Christian religion, and to the communion of that Church which is Catholic, and which is called Catholic not only by those who belong to her, but also by all her enemies. Whether they will it or not, the very heretics themselves and followers of schism, when they converse, not with their own, but with outsiders, call that only Catholic which is really Catholic. For they cannot be understood, unless they distinguish her by that name, by which she is known throughout the whole earth" (St. Augustine).

"Many things retain me in the bosom of the Catholic Church—the very name of Catholic detains me in it, which she has so happily preserved amidst the different heretics, that whereas they are all desirous of being called Catholics, yet, if any stranger were to ask them, which is the assembly of the Catholics? None of them would dare to point out his place of worship" (St. Augustine).

"If your Church is Catholic" (addressing certain heretics) "show me that it spreads its branches throughout the world, for such is the meaning of the word Catholic" (St. Augustine).

St. Vincent of Lerins writes:—"The Catholic or Universal doctrine is that which remains the same through all ages, and will continue so till the end of the world. He is a true Catholic, who firmly adheres to the faith which he knows the Catholic Church has universally taught from the days of old."

"This is the Holy Church—the one Church—the Catholic Church—the true Church, which contending

against all heresies may herself be assailed, but cannot be overcome. All heresies have gone out from her, like useless branches cut off from the vine—she herself remaining fixed to the root—fixed to the stock—fixed in charity, and against which, "the gates of hell shall not prevail" (St. Augustine).

We shall now leave the early Fathers and shall quote from intelligent and honest Protestants who were in no way partial to the Catholic Church. Let us hear what they have to say.

Lord Macaulay says:—"As the Catholics in zeal and union had a great advantage over the Protestants, so they had an infinitely superior organization. In truth Protestantism, for aggressive purposes, had no organization at all. The Reformed Churches were mere national Churches. The Church of England existed for England alone. It was an institution as purely local as the Court of Common Pleas, and was utterly without machinery for foreign operations. The Church of Scotland in like manner, existed for Scotland alone. The operations of the Catholic Church took in the whole world" (Essay on Ranke's History of the Popes).

Mr. Kinglake says:—"The universal aptness of a religious system for all stages of civilization, and for all sorts and conditions of men, well befits its claim of Divine origin. She is of all nations and of all times, that wonderful Church of Rome" (*Eothen*).

Dr. Milman showing how the nations received the light of the Gospel says:—"All these conquests of Christianity were in a certain sense the conquests of the Roman See. . . Reverence for Rome penetrated with the Gospel to the remotest parts. Germany was converted to Latin Christianity. Rome was the source, the centre, the regulating authority recognized by the English Apostles to the Teutons. The clergy were constantly visiting Rome as the religious capital of the world . . . and bishops from the remotest parts of the empire, and of regions never penetrated by the Roman arms, looked to Rome as the parent of their faith—if not to an infallible authority, at least to the

highest authority in Christendom" (Milman's *History of Latin Christianity*).

Dr. Spry writes:—"From the facts which are recorded in Scripture, and which other historical testimony confirms we infer that the Apostles, in the exercise of the power vested in them, instituted that ecclesiastical polity which was maintained in the Church until the period of the Reformation."

Mitchell says:—"Deep and indelible is the debt which religion and civilization owe to the early Roman Pontiffs and to the Church of Rome. They strove long and nobly to forward the cause of human improvement . . . Monks and missionaries, disregarding personal danger, penetrated into the forests of Germany and into the distant regions of the North, and unappalled by the deaths of torture to which so many holy men had fallen victims preached to the heathen and barbarian the mild doctrines of Christianity, which only sprang up in Europe watered by the blood of saints and martyrs."

Perhaps we could not give a better illustration of the universality of the Church than the last, and great Council of the Vatican. It was a Council which showed the world-wide sway of the Catholic Church. The Protestant papers of London described the Council in the most eloquent language.

"In historic importance, in traditional dignity, in the splendour of associations that gather round its name, no assembly in the world, past or present, can pretend to compare with the great Parliament of the Latin Church.

"The unbroken continuity of the history of that Church is undeniable, and uninterrupted descent from the Church founded by the Apostles renders this Council . . . . the immediate representative, in a sense in which no other Council can rival its claims, of the Council of Nicea, if not of the Council of Jerusalem . . . . the dispassionate observer is compelled to confess that the spectacle of so many hundreds of bishops, coming from the farthest quarters of the globe, at the beck of an old man, powerless in all but spiritual

thunderbolts, is one that, occurring in the nineteenth century, and especially at this period of it, is calculated to strike the believing with pious admiration, and even the incredulous, like ourselves, with irrepressible astonishment" (*The Standard*).

"It must be admitted that weak as is the temporal power of the Pope, no other prince could have assembled such a body as met to-day in the council hall of St. Peter's, and no other could have provided them with such a magnificent temple. From the remotest quarters of the globe, from a land that was first heard of when the Council of Trent sat, from a land that was then wholly unknown, from Palestine and Syria, the cradles of Christianity, from Persia, from China, from India, from Africa, from the Western Isles, as well as from the countries washed by the Mediterranean, men of various tongues, of diverse origin, men of great learning and great age have come together in this famous city in obedience, voluntary and spiritual obedience, to the great Pastor who claims to be the successor of St. Peter and the Vicegerent of God" (*The Daily News*).

CHAPTER VI.

The Apostolicity of the Church.

When we say that the Church is Apostolical we mean (1) that she must teach the same doctrines as did the Apostles; (2) that her ministers must have valid Orders which include the power of forgiving sins in the Sacrament of Penance, and the power of consecrating the Eucharist in the Sacrifice of the Mass. It is well to keep these two points before the mind and to keep them distinct, because some heretics might

have one and be without the other, for instance the Arians and other eastern schismatics have validly ordained priests, but are not Apostolic because they either teach false doctrine on a few points, or have no jurisdiction, being separated from the centre of unity. The Church is then Apostolical as to its doctrine and its ministers.

Apostolicity is sometimes confounded with validity of orders. Valid orders are only a part of Apostolical Succession. Apostolicity is a wider term and implies that in the true Church there are successors to the Apostles who without any break inherit the doctrine, jurisdiction, orders, and mission of the Apostles.

That the true Church must be Apostolical as regards doctrine is clear. It cannot be conceived to be otherwise, because the Apostles taught the very doctrines which were taught by Christ Himself. These doctrines were true and could not be departed from without sin, there was an obligation on the part of the Apostles to teach them, and on the part of the people to accept them; "teach all nations;" "he that believeth not shall be condemned." Doctrines which would contradict those taught by the Apostles must of necessity be false.

Therefore when we want to find out the true Church we have only to look around us and see what Church is teaching the same doctrines as did the Apostles; and whose ministers have uninterrupted succession from them:

Only one Church can say that the doctrines that are being taught in it are identical with the doctrine of Apostolic times.

Compare the doctrines of the Catholic Church of today with the doctrines of Apostolic times and you will find that they are in perfect agreement. We shall do this with regard to two doctrines which were always rejected by Protestants, viz., Penance and the Eucharist.

Confession exists in the Catholic Church at present; this is a fact admitted by all. Did it exist in the early Church?

St. Cyprian exhorts all sinners to a timely repentance

and to make an humble confession of their sins, and he says in addition that "when absolution is given at random it is dangerous to the givers and useless to the receivers."

St. Basil says:—"In the confession of sins the same method should be employed as in laying open the infirmities of the body. Our sins must be confessed to those to whom has been committed the dispensation of the mysteries of God."

St. Ambrose writes:—"The poison is sin, the remedy, the accusation of one's crime, the poison is iniquity, confession is the remedy against relapse" and Paulinus who was the Secretary of St. Ambrose relates in his life of that great saint that he used to weep over the penitents whose confessions he heard.

St. Augustine writes:—"Our merciful God wills us to confess in this world that we may not be confounded in the other:" and again he says, "let no one say to himself I do penance to God in private, I do it before God. It is then in vain that Christ hath said 'whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' It is in vain that the keys have been given to the Church. Do we make void the Gospel? void the word of God?"

With regard to the doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist Catholics at the present day believe that Jesus Christ is truly, really, and substantially present in the Sacrament of the Altar. The early Church held exactly the same doctrine.

St. Chrysostom says:—"He that was present at the last supper, is the same who is now present, and consecrates our feast: for it is not man who makes the things lying on the altar become the Body and Blood of Christ, but that Christ who was crucified for us. The words are pronounced by the priest, but it is the power and grace of God that consecrates them. He said, 'this is My Body,' these words make the change. Again He says, 'as many as partake of this Body, as many as taste of this Blood, think it nothing different from that which sits above, and is adored by angels.'"

St. Augustine says:—"They (the Jews) were con-

verted, they were baptized, they approached the table of the Lord, and now believing, they drank that blood which in their rage they had shed."

Protestant doctrine is certainly in contradiction to the above. We could make similar comparisons with regard to every other doctrine of the Catholic Church.

The Catholic Church never at any time condemned a doctrine as false and afterwards approved of it as true or vice versa; in the words of St. Augustine its motto is *semper eadem.*

The Scripture cannot be mistaken on this point. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians says: "As we said before, so now I say again: If any one preach to you a gospel, besides that which you have received, let him be anathema" (Gal. i. 9).

"Therefore, brethren, stand fast; and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our Epistle" (2 Thess. ii. 14).

"And the things, which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also" (2 Tim. ii. 2). "Built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone" (Ephes. ii. 20).

The early Fathers speak most emphatically on this subject.

St. Irenaeus of Lyons says:—"We can count up those who were appointed bishops in the Churches by the Apostles and their successors down to us; none of those taught this doctrine. But as it would be tedious to enumerate the succession of bishops in the different Churches, we refer you to the tradition of that greatest, most ancient, and universally known Church, founded at Rome by St. Peter and Paul, and which has been preserved there through the succession of its Bishops down to the present time."

"Things being thus made plain, it is not from others that truth is to be sought, which is easily learned from the Church. For to this Church as into a rich repository, the Apostles committed whatever is divine truth;

that each one, if so inclined might thence draw the drink of life. This is the way of life ; all other teachers must be shunned as thieves and robbers" (Irenaeus).

Tertullian speaks most plainly : "We are not allowed to indulge our own humour, nor to choose what another has invented. We have the Apostles of our Lord as founders, who were not themselves the inventors nor authors of what they left us, but they have faithfully taught the world that doctrine which they received from Christ."

"Now to know what the Apostles taught—that is, what Christ revealed to them, recourse must be had to the Churches which they founded, and which they instructed by word of mouth, and by their epistles. For it is plain, that all doctrine which is conformable to the faith of these mother Churches is true, being that which they received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God; and that all other opinions must be novel and false" (Tertullian).

That the Catholic Church is Apostolical as regards ministers was never denied. We shall be brief here as we shall say more on the subject when we come to speak of Anglican Orders.

What does the Bible say ?

St. Paul writing to Titus says:—"For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and shouldest ordain priests in every city as I also appointed thee" (Titus i. 5).

"And when they had ordained them priests in every Church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, in whom they believed" (Acts. xiv. 22).

Tertullian speaking of certain heretics says:—"Let them produce the origin of their Church, let them display the succession of their bishops, so that the first of them may appear to have been ordained by an Apostolic man who persevered in their communion."

St. Augustine says:—"I am kept in this Church by the succession of prelates from St. Peter, to whom the Lord committed the care of His sheep, down to the present bishop."

St. Athanasius writes:—"Let us again consider from the earliest period, the tradition the doctrine, and the faith of the Catholic Church, which God first delivered which the Apostles proclaimed, and the succeeding Fathers fostered and preserved. On these authorities the Church is founded, and whoever falls from her communion neither is, nor can be called a Christian."

St. Cyprian in his treatise *De Unitate Ecclesiae* writes:—"Christ says to His Apostles, and through them to all His ministers, who by a regular ordination succeeded to them—'He that heareth you heareth, Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth Me'" (St. Luke x. 16).

Origen writes:—"Let him look to it, who arrogantly puffed up, contemns the Apostolic words. To me it is good to adhere to Apostolic men as to God and His Christ, and to draw the intelligence from the scriptures, according to the sense, that has been delivered by them."

Irenaeus says: "It is a duty to obey the priests of the Church, who hold their succession from the Apostles, and who, with that succession received agreebly to the Will of the Father, are the sure pledge of truth; but as to those who belong not to that leading succession, they may be united, they should be suspected, either as heretics, or schismatics."

CHAPTER VII.

The Catholic Church proved to be the Church of Christ.

Up to the present we have not distinctly pointed out the one true Church of Christ, but now that we know the marks of the Church of Christ it is for us to apply them and to see which of all the Churches has Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity.

It is important to note that whatever Church is the true Church it must have all these four marks. A Church might have one of them and still not be the true Church; for instance, a small sect might have unity and be without the other marks. The important point is that any Church which has not *all* these four marks must be false.

The Catholic Church has unity because all its members believe the same truths, and are subject to the same authority. You will not find Catholics in one part of the world teaching different doctrines from those who are in other parts. The Catholic Church has sanctity because it was founded by Jesus Christ, its doctrine and sacraments are holy, and great numbers of her children in every age have attained to eminent sanctity. The Catholic Church has Catholicity because it is morally spread over the whole face of the earth, and has the capacity within itself of extending itself everywhere. It is Catholic also because it teaches the same truths in this present age as it did in every past age.

The Catholic Church has Apostolicity because it teaches the same doctrines as were taught by the Apostles, and her ministers have valid Orders having received their powers from the Apostles through an uninterrupted succession.

It would be tedious to apply these marks to all the

different sects which now exist. We shall content ourselves with an examination of the Church of England, because it seems to have higher pretentions than the Protestant sects which have separated themselves from it, and because it claims to have many things which it really has not.

Has the Church of England Unity? Why, it does not even claim this mark because private judgment is at the root of Protestantism. Men of every shade of opinion are tolerated in the Church of England, every person can believe and teach what he likes and is a law unto himself; and this state of things exists not only among the laity but also to a great degree among the clergy.

But let the organs of the Church of England speak for themselves. The *Church Times* writes that the "Church of England has no leaders but irregulars;" and again it writes: "what the bishops now bless they cursed twenty years ago."

The Protestant Bishop of Rochester speaking of confession says:—"No minister of the Church of England is authorised to even encourage the practice."

The Bishop of Lincoln exhorts his clergy to encourage their people to have recourse to confession and believes that he and his clergy have the power to forgive sins.

The Bishop of Liverpool, who is also in the Church of England, tells his clergy that confession is to be shunned and rejects with scorn the idea that his clergy have the power to forgive sins or are sacrificing priests.

Dean Farrar speaking of confession says:—"It was a gradual innovation of the darkest part of the dark ages."

Canon Knox Little speaking of the Church of England with regard to confession says:—"She encourages confession to the priest in certain cases; confession is a most wholesome medicine; in some cases it is the very way of salvation; it checks sin; it relieves the conscience, it is a close approach to Christ."

The present Protestant Bishop of Salisbury says:—"We have not wished to separate ourselves from the Catholic Church."

The present Protestant Bishop of Worcester says:—"If the Church of England is not Protestant she is in a meaningless schism."

Has the Church of England the mark of sanctity? We fear not. We shall again let Protestants speak for themselves.

Lord Macaulay says:—"The Reformation was started by Henry the murderer of his wives, continued by Somerset the murderer of his brother, and completed by Elizabeth the murderer of her guest.

Cobbet says:—"The Reformation was not a work of virtue but of plunder."

Dr. Whittaker in his "Vindication of Mary Queen of Scots" writes:—"Forgery (I blush for the honour of Protestantism while I write it) seems to have been peculiar to the Reformed. I look in vain for one of those accursed outrages of imposition against the disciples of Popery" (3rd vol.). Again he writes:—"Forgery seems to have been the peculiar disease of Protestantism." If men were holy could they give themselves to lying and forgery?

Protestantism has not been able to produce one solitary saint in three hundred and fifty years. Its highest ideals are common-place when compared with those of the Catholic Church.

Is the Church of England Catholic? The Church of England is not Catholic nor is it even national. Half the people of England do not belong to it. It is not Catholic as regards doctrine because it is a mass of contradictions, nor is it Catholic in the sense that it has moral universality, because it is for England alone and her colonies and it can never acquire the power of becoming universal because it is wanting in unity.

But some Protestants call themselves Catholics, and is not this enough to make them so in reality? Our answer is that it is not. They are not known to the world as Catholics, and people will not acknowledge their right to that glorious title. It is very easy to make an effort to adopt a name but it is difficult to get the world to acknowledge it. Has the Church of England

Apostolicity? Why everything that is embraced under the title was rejected at the Reformation, and at that time almost the whole body of Catholic and Apostolic teaching was rejected by Protestants. They disbelieved in ordination, and consecration. They rejected confession and the Sacrifice of the Mass, &c. (See Milner on *Apostolicity*.)

We shall now give extracts from writers who are for the most part Protestant. These extracts will help to prove that Protestantism is false and Catholicity is true.

Lord Macaulay writes:—"If the system on which the founders of the Church of England acted could have been permanent, the Reformation would have been in a political sense the greatest curse that ever fell upon our country."

"The land which was the cradle of the Reformation has become the grave of the Reformed faith. Denial of every tenet of the Protestant faith among the thinking classes, and indifference in the masses, are the positive and negative agencies beneath which the Church of Luther and Melancthon has succumbed. In contiguous parishes of Catholic and Protestant populations, one invariable distinction has long been patent to all eyes and conclusions.

"The path to the Catholic Church is trodden bare, that to the Protestant Church is rank with grasses and weeds to the very door" (*Edinburgh Review*, Oct. 1880).

"A reign of terror, organized with consummate and merciless skill, held England panic-stricken at Henry's feet. The noblest heads rolled on the block. Virtue and learning could not save Thomas More; royal descent could not save Lady Salisbury. The execution of queen after queen taught England that nothing was too high for Henry's 'courage,' or too sacred for his 'appetite.'

"Parliament assembled only to sanction acts of unscrupulous tyranny, or to build up by its own statutes the great fabric of absolute rule. All the constitutional safeguards of English freedom were swept away. Arbitrary taxation, arbitrary legislation, arbitrary im-

prisonment were powers claimed without dispute and unsparingly exercised by the crown" (Green's *Short History of the English People*).

Dutithius a learned Protestant divine in his epistle to Beza writes:—

"What sort of people are our Protestants, straggling to and fro, and carried about with every wind and doctrine, sometimes to this side, sometimes to that? You may, perhaps, know what their sentiments in matters of religion are to day; but you can never certainly tell what they will be to-morrow. In what article of religion do these Churches agree which have cast off the bishop of Rome? Examine all from top to bottom, and you will scarce find one thing affirmed by one, which is not immediately condemned by another for wicked doctrine."

Let us now see what learned Protestants say of the Catholic Church.

Lord Macaulay writes:—"There is not and there never has been, on this earth a work of human policy so well deserving of examination as the Roman Catholic Church. The history of that Church joins together the two great ages of human civilization. No other institution is left standing which carries the mind back to the time when the smoke of sacrifice rose from the Pantheon, and when camelopards and tigers bounded in the Flavian amphitheatre. The proudest royal houses are but of yesterday when compared with the supreme Pontiffs. That line we trace back in an unbroken series from the Pope who crowned Napoleon in the nineteenth century to the Pope who crowned Pepin in the eighth; and far beyond the time of Pepin, the august dynasty extends till it is lost in the twilight of fable. . . . She saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world; and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourish-

ed in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St Paul's."

The Protestant Milman writes:—"Latin Christianity, or rather Universal Christendom was one—not only in the organization of the all-ruling hierarchy—it was one in the great system of belief. The whole world was one in the popular religion."

The Protestant Cutts writes:—"In the middle ages the Church was the great popular institution, and one reason no doubt, of the popularity of the mediaeval Church was, that it had always been the champion of the people and the friend of the poor. In politics the Church was always on the side of the liberties of the people, against the tyranny of the feudal lords."

Froude the historian writes: "When England was Catholic in the eye of the clergy the serf and his lord stood on the common level of sinful humanity;" again he tells us "The Church ruled the state with the authority of a conscience, and self interest, as a motive of action, was only named to be abhorred."

"Rome covered Europe with halls of learning: Rome turned savages into Christian nations: Rome gave lessons in democracy, for she admitted serfs to her priesthood, and Norman nobles, who would not eat with Saxon gentlemen, were obliged to confess their sins to Saxon peasant priests. Rome ignored the hereditary principle. The Pope-King was elected; Rome assumed all men to have equal rights to national opportunities a Saxon blacksmith's son was elected in the darkest of the ages Sovereign Pontiff. And Rome gave more martyrs to the stake, more patriots to the nation-hood, more lives to sanctity, more self sacrifice to philanthropy, and more intellect to philosophy than all other churches" (John Ferguson).

The Rev. E. L. Stoddard, rector of St. John's Free Episcopal Church, Summit-Avenue, Jersey City in a protest against the American Protective Association says:

"I doubt if the A. P. A. leaders have any idea of the work done by the priests of the Roman Church to instruct, restrain, and lift up their people. We speak of the sacrifices of the Salvation Army, but forget that the priests of Rome have done that sort of work for 1,500 years or more. We speak of the devotion of Army Lassies in going after the fallen, and let us give them all due praise; but do not forget the tens of thousands of Catholic Sisters of Charity who have done the same work for centuries. If the A.P.A. wishes to know what the Roman Church is to its people, let them stand at the corner of Bramhall and Ocean Avenues and see the people go to church. Do they think it wise to attempt to destroy a religion which brings out such devotion, or that they could do it if they tried? The danger to this country is not to come from Roman Catholicism, but from infidelity, from a luxurious, materialistic, and selfish spirit which worships nothing but itself, from a divided and quarrelling Christianity, which has given us more sects than there were gods in pagan times. The danger will be found in confounding zeal for God and love for Christ with the narrow partisanship of a society like the A.P.A., which we again declare to be unconstitutional, un-Protestant, undemocratic, and untrue."

The *Parish Messenger* a Protestant paper published in Nebraska writes: "No part of the Christian Church can show a more indomitable courage and devotion, a more tireless spirit for the conversion of heathen men and savages at every cost of comfort, of ease of home, of worldly advantage, of life itself than the Roman Catholic Church."

Canon Farrar writes:—"Once more consider what the Church did for education. Her ten thousand monasteries kept alive and transmitted that torch of learning which otherwise would have been extinguished long before. A religious education, incomparably superior to the mere athleticism of the noble's hall, was extended to the meanest serf who wished for it."

Again he writes:—"From the fifth to the thirteenth century, the Church was engaged in elaborating the

most splendid organization which the world has ever seen."

Dean Milman writes:—"On the throne of Rome alone, of all the greater Sees, did religion maintain its majesty, its sanctity, its piety; and if it demanded undue deference, the world would not be inclined rigidly to question pretensions supported as well by such singular and unimpeachable virtue."

Mr. Kinglake writes:—"The universal aptness of a religious system for all stages of civilization, and for all sorts and conditions of men, well befits the claim of Divine origin. She is of all nations and of all times that wonderful Church of Rome."

The illustrious Balmez (Catholic) writes: "It is not new in the history of the human mind for a doctrine, more or less reasonable, to be professed for a time by a certain number of enlightened men; but for a creed to maintain itself for ages by preserving the adhesion of men of learning of all countries and times, of minds differing and divided on other points, is a phenomenon not to be found outside the Catholic Church. Nowhere else can be found such an extraordinary combination of knowledge in union with faith, of genius in willing submission to authority; nowhere else can be found existing for centuries an uninterrupted series of enlightened minds ever in union with the doctrines of one Church, and ever submissive to her guidance."

The following extracts from the early Fathers will not be out of place here.

St. Augustine says:—"Many are the considerations which keep me in the Catholic Church—the assent of nations—her authority—first established by miracles—cherished by hope—extended by charity—strengthened by lapse of years; the succession of pastors from the chair of Peter, to whom the Lord committed the care of feeding his flock down to the present bishop; lastly the name itself of Catholic."

Again he writes:—"The Catholic Church alone is the body of Christ; the Holy Ghost gives life to no one who is out of this body. . . . Salvation no one can

have but in the Catholic Church. Out of the Catholic Church he may have anything but salvation. He may have honour, he may have baptism, he may have the gospel, he may both believe and preach in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; but he can find salvation nowhere but in the Catholic Church." In another place he says: "In the Catholic Church there are both good and bad. But those that are separated from her, as long as their opinions are opposite to hers, cannot be good. For though the conversation of some of them appears commendable, yet their very separation from the Church makes them bad according to that of our Saviour, St. Luke xi. 14. 'He that is not with Me is against Me; and he that gathers not with Me scattereth.'"

St. Cyprian says:—"The house of God is but one, and no one can have salvation but in the Church:" again he says, "He cannot have God for his Father, who has not the Church for his Mother. If anyone could escape who was out of the Ark of Noah, then he who is out of the Church may also escape;" and the following words of the same saint have as much force at the present day as when they were first written: "Yet if you believe not words believe facts. How many tryants have tried to crush her, how many teeth of wild beasts, how many sharp swords; where are they consigned to? where is the Church? their names forgotten and the Church immortal."

St. Chrysostom writes:—"We know that salvation belongs to the Church alone, and that no one can partake of Christ, nor be saved out of the Catholic Church and the Catholic faith."

Lactantius says:—"It is the Catholic Church only which retains the true worship. This Church is the fountain of truth, it is the house of faith, it is the temple of God. If anyone either comes not into this Church, or departs from it, his eternal salvation is desperate. No one must flatter himself obstinately, for his soul and salvation are at stake."

These passages from the Fathers lead us to the

question which is often asked, is there any salvation outside the Catholic Church? This question requires explanation. A person who is baptized, who never with full knowledge and consent committed grave sin, and who through no fault of his own lives in a false religion believing it to be true, and living up to the lights which he has received will be saved. In other words a person who is outside the Catholic Church through invincible ignorance will be saved if he is baptized, has lived a good life, and died in the state of God's grace

Invincible ignorance is ignorance which cannot be overcome. There are three conditions required for invincible ignorance: (1) A person must have a sincere desire to know the truth, that is, to know which is the true Church of God. (2) He must not only desire to find out the truth, but also be prepared to embrace it at any cost. (3) He must make use of all the means at his disposal to obtain a knowledge of the truth, and to the embracing of it when he has found it.

The idea that men can be saved by belonging to whatever sect they like is a product of modern Rationalism. St. Cyprian has the expression, "extra ecclesiam nulla salus," no salvation outside the Church. Such was, the belief in the Protestant Church until recent times. In the eighteenth of the Thirty-nine Articles it says: "That those are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature. For the holy scripture doth set out to us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby man can be saved." Such also was the belief of the Church of Scotland.

Before we finish treating of the Church we shall say a few brief words about the development of Christian doctrine. To put it briefly a new definition does not create a new doctrine, the definition is new but the doctrine about which the definition has to do is as old as Christianity.

Some things are explicitly contained in the deposit

of faith and others implicitly; and what is to be explicitly held as of faith is not generally defined until some person denies it, for until then there would be no necessity for so defining it. For instance the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ was not defined until the time of the Council of Nice, but it was always believed in the Church. Could it be said that, because the Church defined it as an article of faith to be explicitly believed, thereby a new doctrine was introduced?

An example will best illustrate this point which is often a great difficulty with Protestants. In modern times since the invention of the telescope some planets which were unknown to us before have been discovered. The discovery of these planets is new, but the planets themselves were in the heavens before we discovered them. We have increased our knowledge but we did not bring into existence new planets.

CHAPTER VIII.

Catholics or Roman Catholics.

The term Roman Catholic is sometimes applied to us in a wrong sense. We are quite satisfied to be called Roman Catholics, in fact we are proud of the title, but we expect that the term shall be used in its proper sense. If non-Catholics apply the term to us in the sense in which we understand it we have not the slightest objection to its use.

When we speak of the Roman Catholic Church we mean the one and the only true Church of Christ, in other words we mean it to signify a Church whose centre is at Rome, but whose circumference is the world.

The Church is Catholic in as much as this word designates her circumference which is world wide; and she is Roman in as much as that word designates that

which constitutes her universality, the seat of universal empire which is at Rome. The centre of the Catholic Church is at Rome, "the mother and the mistress of all the Churches." We call the Church Catholic, and we call it Roman Catholic and both expressions have the same meaning and the same extension. One is not wider than the other. It is not as if all Christians were Catholics; and Roman Catholic a sect of Christians, within the general term Catholic, which held peculiar doctrines: or were a branch of some great Church made up of all Christian sects. When we speak of Roman Catholics then, we do not mean that they are a part within a greater whole; this would be to give the term a wrong meaning. No one is a Catholic who is not also a Roman Catholic.

We shall explain this point in other words; Roman Catholic does not mean that the Church is Catholic by way of genus and that she is Roman by way of species, as if Roman Catholicism meant a branch of a great tree made up of all the different Christian sects. The Church of Christ which is and must be Catholic includes all nations, and the Roman Catholic Church alone fulfils this condition, It is wrong to use the term Roman Catholic as identical with the local Church of Rome, or as signifying what some in this country are pleased to call the "Italian Mission." It is surprising to see the difficulties and the absurdities in which some people outside the Catholic Church find themselves when they make an attempt to explain their position before the Christian world. For three hundred years the Church of England gloried in the name of Protestantism and rejected with scorn the name of Catholic. She is now striving to steal that glorious title from us who always retained it. The world outside calls us by this name and will not give it to any others. It is easy for them to adopt the name, but it is difficult to get the world to acknowledge it. Again what was so common as for Protestants to say that the Church of Rome was buried in error and corruption for eight or nine hundred years, and that this was the cause of their separation from

her. Now they say that they never separated, and fall back on what is known as the continuity and branch theories. Montalembert sums up all their tactics in a few happy words.

"I protest against the most unwarrantable and most unjustifiable assumption of the name Catholic by people and things belonging to the actual Church of England It is easy to take up a name, but it is not easy to get it acknowledged by the world and by competent authority. The attempt to steal away from us, and to appropriate to the use of a fraction of the Church of England, the glorious title of Catholic is proved to be an usurpation by every monument of the past and present; by the Coronation Oath of your sovereign; by all the laws that have established your Church; even by the answer of your own University of Oxford to the lay address against Dr. Pusey, where the Church of England is justly called the Protestant Reformed Church. The name itself is spurned with indignation by the greater half at least of those who belong to the Church of England, just as the Church itself is rejected with scorn and indignation by the greater half of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom. Even the debased Russian Church—that Church where lay despotism has closed the Church's mouth and turned her into a slave—disdains to recognize Anglicans as Catholics. Consistent Protestants and Rationalists are more Catholic in the etymological sense of the word than Anglicans. But that so-called Anglo-Catholics, whose very name betrays their usurpation and contradiction, whose doctrinal articles, whose liturgy, whose whole history are such as to disconnect them from all mankind, except those who are born English and speak English, that they should pretend, on the strength of their private judgment alone, to be what the rest of mankind deny them to be, will assuredly be ranked among the first follies of the nineteenth century. I protest, therefore, against the usurpation of the sacred name as iniquitous, and I next protest against the objects of this Society, and all such efforts in the Anglican Church as absurd."

CHAPTER IX.

The Continuity Theory.

Protestants at the present day are exceedingly anxious to throw a cloak over the origin of their religion. They are beginning to realize their isolated position in the Christian world. Neither the Church in the East nor the Church in the West will acknowledge them.

The advance of education and modern travel have done much to help Protestants to see how they are separated from the whole Christian world. Some people are misled very much in this matter; they think that because they have possession of the grand cathedrals and churches which were built by their Catholic forefathers, and intended for Catholic worship, that they have the same faith as had their ancestors. To argue in this way is just as illogical as to say that if a robber broke into a man's house and stole his property, he should be received among the members of his family. The possession of temporalites proves nothing. Did not the Reformers destroy the altars, reject the Sacrifice of the Mass, murder priests, and sweep away from the land almost every vestige of the ancient faith.?

It is a strange thing that Protestants of the present day should claim continuity with the Catholic and pre-Reformation Church which they are accustomed to say has been buried in error and corruption for the long space of eight or nine hundred years, and which they did their utmost to destroy.

Where is the continuity between the pre-Reformation Church of England which was Catholic, and the established Church of the present day? There is scarcely a trace of resemblance.

Before the Reformation the bishops swore obedience "to St. Peter, the Holy Apostolic Church, and to my Lord the Pope." The Protestant Bishops swear that the Pope hath no jurisdiction of any kind whatsoever

in this realm, and take an oath acknowledging the Sovereign as the Supreme head of the Protestant Reformed Church in England. In pre-Reformation times the people went to Confession, believed in the Sacrifice of the Mass, in the real Presence, Extreme Unction, Prayers for the dead, the Invocation of saints, &c. Now all these were rejected by the Protestant Reformed Church. This is strange continuity. The High Church and Ritualistic parties, who are teaching almost all the Catholic doctrines, are in the same position as the Low Church. They are Protestants. They are in the Church of England. They eat the bread of that Church and many of them have indeed fine livings. They subscribed to the thirty-nine Articles although they do not seem to consider them as having much binding force. They adhere to the principle of private interpretation. They reject the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception, Papal Supremacy and Infallibility although some of them read the Pope's Encyclicals in their Churches for the benefit of their Congregations, and take advantage of a Papal dispensation from fasting in times of influenza. An early writer says:—"There can be nothing more dangerous than those heretics who admit nearly the whole cycle of doctrine, and yet by one word, as with a drop of poison, infect the real and simple faith taught by our Lord and handed down by Apostolic Tradition" (Auctor Tract de fide orthodoxa contra Arianos. The Pope's Letter).

The Branch Theory, which holds that the Church of Christ is made up of the Latin, Greek and Anglican Churches, as so many branches of one great tree, is another modern invention which is popular only with a small section of the High Church Party, who forget that the Latin Church will not hold that Anglicans are in the fold of the Catholic Church; and that the Eastern Chuch in the year 1672 "anathematized Protestantism" at the Council of Bethlehem.

CHAPTER X.

Anglican Orders.

We have space only for a few remarks on Anglican Orders; to treat this question at length would be going outside the scope of the present little work.

By valid orders we mean, practically, the power of offering up sacrifice, and the power of forgiving sins in the Sacrament of Penance; and these two powers were rejected by the Reformers.

Cranmer, who was the first Father of the Church of England, rejected totaliter the idea of Apostolic Succession, and not only did he not believe in it, but he even showed his contempt for it by cutting out of the Ordinal the essential words denoting the conferring of Orders, and drew up a rite of his own, which did not contain any words which could possibly convey the idea that priests at their Ordination were to receive power to consecrate the Eucharist in the Sacrifice of the Mass, or to forgive sins. The form that was used in the consecration of a bishop was still more faulty.

The form of Ordination for a priest, according to Cranmer's Ordinal, which was drawn up in the reign of Edward VI., was: "Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained: and be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments."

For the consecration of a Bishop it was: "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee, by the imposition of hands."

Cranmer's Ordinal was used by the reformers for over one hundred years. After this lapse of time their attention was drawn to the defects in the form of the Sacrament by the Scotch Presbyterians who did not believe in Bishops. This was in 1662. The reformers, seeing the mistake which was made, drew up a new form

CHAPTER X.

Anglican Orders.

We have space only for a few remarks on Anglican Orders; to treat this question at length would be going outside the scope of the present little work.

By valid orders we mean, practically, the power of offering up sacrifice, and the power of forgiving sins in the Sacrament of Penance; and these two powers were rejected by the Reformers.

Cranmer, who was the first Father of the Church of England, rejected totaliter the idea of Apostolic Succession, and not only did he not believe in it, but he even showed his contempt for it by cutting out of the Ordinal the essential words denoting the conferring of Orders, and drew up a rite of his own, which did not contain any words which could possibly convey the idea that priests at their Ordination were to receive power to consecrate the Eucharist in the Sacrifice of the Mass, or to forgive sins. The form that was used in the consecration of a bishop was still more faulty.

The form of Ordination for a priest, according to Cranmer's Ordinal, which was drawn up in the reign of Edward VI., was: "Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained: and be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments."

For the consecration of a Bishop it was: "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee, by the imposition of hands."

Cranmer's Ordinal was used by the reformers for over one hundred years. After this lapse of time their attention was drawn to the defects in the form of the Sacrament by the Scotch Presbyterians who did not believe in Bishops. This was in 1662. The reformers, seeing the mistake which was made, drew up a new form

and restored the words conferring the orders, but of course the succession was lost in the meantime, because according to all theologians a substantial defect in the form invalidates the Sacraments.

Parker on whom the succession depends was consecrated according to the Ordinal of Cranmer. Moreover it is doubtful in the extreme whether Barlow, the Bishop who consecrated Parker was himself ever consecrated. There is no record of this event. Richardson says:—"Dies consecrationis ejus (Barlow) nondum apparet." It would be rather strange for men who did not believe in consecration to go through the ceremony, and nothing is so natural as to suppose that they would dispense themselves from it altogether. It is an established fact that Cranmer, Barlow, Parker, and Pilkington who all lived about the same time, and who were the first Fathers of the Church of England held that no consecration was required; that the king or queen appointing a man to be a Bishop was quite sufficent.

The first Bishops of the Reformation preached openly that the king's appointment without any consecration was sufficient to make a bishop; some of them used to maintain that "a priest or a bishop can as well be made by the Town Crier, if commissioned by the civil power, as by the Metropolitan." Acting upon these principles some of these zealous Reformers did not go through any form of consecration whatsoever, and when reproached with this by the Catholic Bishops of the day, they never refuted the charge. Their only defence was to ridicule the ceremony of consecration, and to say that it was not required. They were satisfied with the king's mandate.

The Low Church Bishops of the present day follow close on the footsteps of their first founders. Who would say that Dr. Ryle the present Protestant Bishop of Liverpool believes in Apostolic Succession. He rejects with scorn the idea that his clergy have the power of forgiving sins or of offering up Sacrifice. Whilst this is so with regard to the Bishop of Liverpool it is strange to see the Bishop of Salisbury who belongs to

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of hands, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee."

(4) The Anglicans themselves for the most part reject Apostolic Succession, they do not claim it, in fact they do not want to have the power to offer Sacrifice, or to forgive sins.

(5) Anglican Orders were never acknowledged outside her own communion.*

(See Milner's excellent Chapters on this subject.)

CHAPTER XI.

The Infallibility of the Church.

It is admitted by all that God has revealed certain truths to man, which he could not discover by reason, or by human authority or by any other means within his reach.

That these revealed truths have been subject to contradictory interpretations experience has undoubtedly proved. Now if there is not some authority left us by God to tell us what is the true interpretation of His revelation this latter would cease to be of use as a revelation. Therefore there must be some authority upon earth with a commission from God to tell us the true meaning of the revelation which He has given us.

Such an authority must be infallible, because God would not bind us to listen to an authority which might lead us to believe in false doctrine. Catholics believe that the Church is this divinely commissioned authority endowed with infallibility, that is, preserved from the

* Note: As we go to press Leo XIII. has declared that "ordinations carried out according to the Anglican rite have been, and are absolutely null and void."

danger of falling into error when it is deciding what is revealed truth, or in teaching doctrines on faith and morals to be held by the whole Church.

The word Church has many meanings—here it means the teaching authority or the living voice of the Church. Protestants often say that Catholics do not know where the infallibility of the Church lies. Catholics have always maintained that the Church was infallible, and have always known where this infallibility rested. All the bishops of the Church with the Pope who is the Vicar of Christ are infallible in dogma. The decrees of a general council dealing with faith and morals are infallible when sanctioned by the Pope. The Pope himself is infallible when speaking *ex cathedra*, that is, when acting as head of the Church and declaring points on doctrine or on matters with regard to faith and morals to be held by the whole Church.

Protestants believe that the writers of the books of Sacred Scripture were guided by the Holy Ghost in their writings, and if God could preserve these from essential error He could preserve the Apostles and their successors.

There must be some authority on earth which is infallible because if there were not, the revelation of God would be of no utility; but such is not the case because God has commanded us to listen to His revelation and to believe in it, and to hear those whom He commissioned to preach it. The Catholic Church alone claims this gift of infallibility.

To say that the Scripture alone and not the Church is infallible is like a man appealing from the decisions of the judges and supreme courts to the law books.

In every-day life no one is allowed to have recourse to law books (commentaries on English laws) and settle the case in his own favour. This is the privilege of conflicting Protestant sects with their cry of the Bible and the Bible alone. A point of English law is decided by the judges who are supposed to interpret the law rightly; a point of revealed doctrine is in the same way decided by the living voice of

the Church to which Christ has said "I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world."

Proofs from Scripture.

"Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (St. Matt xvi 18). If the Church of God could teach false doctrine, the gates of hell would have prevailed against it, because the greatest victory the powers of hell could gain would be to see the Church of Christ teaching error. But the gates of hell shall never prevail against the Church because Christ has said that they shall not, and the promise of Christ shall always come to pass. Therefore the Church of God can never teach false doctrine or fall into error.

In St. John Chap. xx. 21, Christ says to his Apostles "As the Father sent Me; I also send you." Christ was sent by His Eternal Father to teach truth; the Apostles were sent in the same way by Christ; therefore their teaching is infallibly true.

"He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me. And he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me" (St. Luke x. 16). In this text it is said to be the same to hear the Apostles as to hear Christ, &c. But the doctrine which the people heard from Christ was infallibly true; so also must the doctrine which was preached to them by the Apostles, because it is declared to be the same to hear the Apostles as to hear Christ Himself.

St. Paul in his Epistle to Timothy calls the Church "the pillar and the ground of truth" (Tim. iii. 15). But if the Church could teach false doctrine St. Paul could not speak in this way.

It might be said that the Apostles were infallible in their teaching, but not their successors. This is a mere subterfuge, for we have the express promise of our Divine Lord himself that He shall be always with His Church. "Behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world" (St. Matt. xxviii. 20). But

if the Holy Ghost is with His Church it cannot fall into error. There is as much necessity for infallibility now as in the first ages; in fact there is more necessity.

Infallibility does not depend upon the learning or the sanctity of the Pope or the Bishops of the Church; but upon the promise given by God that He will be always with His Church to guard it against error.

As further proof we give the following extracts from the ancient fathers who were faithful guardians of revealed Truth.

St. Cyprian who lived in the third century says:—"Men are exposed to error because they turn not their eyes to the fountain of truth, nor is the head sought for, nor the doctrine of the heavenly Father upheld: which thing would anyone seriously weigh, no long arguing would be necessary: The proof is easy—Christ addresses Peter, "I say to thee, thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. He that does not hold this unity of the Church, can he think that he holds the faith? he that opposes and withstands the Church can he trust that he is in the Church?"

In the fourth century St. Athanasius writes: Let us consider again from the earliest period, the tradition, the doctrine, and the faith of the Catholic Church which God first delivered, which the Apostles proclaimed, and succeeding Fathers fostered and preserved. On these authorities the church is founded, and whoever falls from her communion neither is nor can be called a Christian."

St. Cyril writes:—"Learn sedulously from the Church, which are the Books of the Old and New testament." And again he writes: "Guard the faith, and that faith alone which is now delivered to thee by the Church, confirmed as it is by all the Scriptures." From all this it is clear that the Church of Christ is infallible. We shall next consider where the infallibility of the Church lies.

CHAPTER XII.

Papal Infallibility.

The Infallibility of the Pope does not mean that the Pope is impeccable. A Pope may sin, but no Pope can teach error under certain circumstances where God has promised him special assistance.

The Pope as a private theologian might err, or in many other cases where he does not act as head of the Church. The gift of infallibility is promised to him only when he is deciding what should be held as revelation, or what is the doctrine of the Church with regard to faith and morals, in other words when he is as we say, teaching *ex cathedra*.

The Infallibility of the Pope was defined as an article of faith at the Vatican Council (A.D. 1870). We give the words of the definition:—"Wherefore faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian Faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic Religion, and the salvation of the Christian people. We, the Sacred Council approving, teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when discharging the office of Pastor, and Teacher of all Christians, by reason of his supreme apostolic authority he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the whole Church—he, by the Divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, possesses that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding Faith or Morals: and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves unalterable and not from the consent of the Church."

Previous to that time all Catholics believed that the Church was infallible, but there were some doubts as to where this infallibility rested. Some eminent theo-

logians did not hold Papal Infallibility; nevertheless the teaching of theologians was in its favour. It has been also the general feeling of the Church in all ages and has always been acted upon. In every age of the Church appeals were sent to Rome to be decided by the Pope and his decision was regarded as final. St. Ambrose says:—"Where Peter is, there is the Church." The Council of Florence 1439 passed the following decree:—"The Roman Pontiff is really and truly the successor of Peter, the prince of the Apostles, and the Vicar of Christ, the head of the universal Church, and in quality of Father, also the teacher of all Christians; receiving through St. Peter the power and authority of Jesus Christ our Lord."

The definition of Papal Infallibility did not create any new doctrine. The Infallibility of the Pope was always an accepted fact. There must be some organ through which the Church expresses its infallibility, and any other system than the Infallibility of the Pope will not work.

Some might say that the whole Church, composed of the clergy and laity, is infallible, but this system would fail as soon as a dispute arose.

Others would have us believe that a General Council alone is infallible, but a General Council is of rare occurrence, and if it could not be called owing to the interference of temporal powers, &c., the Church would be left without any authoritative decision as to what was right or wrong until it should please kings and emperors to permit of its assembling.

Again a General Council can never consist of all the bishops of the Church, and as a rule there is never complete unanimity. What rule then is the General Council without the Pope to follow? History tells us of no rule which would give its decrees the force of infallibility. The decrees of General Councils were never considered infallible until they had received the sanction of the Pope; and if it is the Pope's decision which gives the decrees of a Council their infallibility why not give his decision the same force in other circumstances.

The Popes always acted as having full power to decide points of doctrine without awaiting the decision of a General Council. Popes have repeatedly acted in this way, and never allowed appeals from their decisions. This shows that the Popes were conscious of their infallible authority and the fact that it was never questioned by the Church is a still further proof.

But some might say that a few Popes were bad men, and that surely they could not be infallible. To this objection we answer by saying that the Pope is not impeccable. A Pope might personally fall into sin, but cannot teach error when acting as the head of the Church and teaching *ex cathedra*.

The Pope is infallible not on account of his learning or his sanctity, or on account of his personality but because of the promise of Christ. The gift is attached to the office not to the man. A judge might give correct decisions in the cases that come before him and yet be bad in his private character. His private vices do not affect the decisions which he gives in the courts of justice. We have examples of this in Sacred Scripture. The Scribes and Pharisees were bad, hypocritical, sinful men, and yet our Lord says of them "The Scribes and Pharisees have sat in the Chair of Moses. All things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do, but according to their works do ye not" (St. Matt. xxii. 23).

In a word the Pope is infallible because he is the organ of the Church. He is the head of the Church. The Church is composed of the head and members. Both are integral parts of the whole and one without the other would be useless, would even cease to exist. The definition of Papal Infallibility created nothing new, introduced no new doctrine, it only settled definitely what was always the general feeling, belief, and practice of the Church.

A good deal of the misunderstanding about the Infallibility of the Pope has arisen from confounding *active* and *passive* infallibility, or at least from not observing the distinction. *Active* infallibility is infallibility in teaching. *Passive* infallibility is infallibility in believing.

PROOFS FROM SCRIPTURE.

"Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against (St. Matt. xvi., 18).

The Church is to last for ever and the powers of hell are not to prevail against it. We are told in this text that "the gates of hell" shall never prevail against the Church and if that is so, much less can they prevail against the foundation on which the Church is built; but St. Peter and his successors are this foundation; therefore the powers of hell shall never prevail against St. Peter. But if St. Peter taught false doctrine the gates of hell would have prevailed against the Church, because the greatest victory the powers of hell could gain over the Church would be to see it teaching error. So we must conclude that St. Peter and his successors can never teach error and must therefore be infallible.

The Church is infallible. St. Peter and his successors are the sources of this infallibility, and must therefore be infallible themselves. The Church is indefectible and must consequently be infallible, for since it is indefectible it must be able to overthrow all its adversaries. Heresy and schism are its greatest adversaries; it must then be able to overcome these; and therefore must be Infallible. But Peter is the source of this infallibility; therefore he must be infallible.

Proof from St. Luke Chap. xxii. 31-32.

"Simon, Simon behold Satan hath desired to have you that he might sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren" (St. Luke xxii. 31-32).

Simon, Simon, ecce Satanas expetivit vos ut cribraret, sicut triticum; ego autem rogavi pro te ut non deficiat fides tua; et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos.

Here Christ says to St. Peter that Satan hath desired to have them (the Apostles), that is, that Satan wished to overcome them, to destroy their faith. Christ in order to counteract this evil design of Satan, takes special

precautions against it, and prays in a special manner for one of them that his faith might not fail, and he being thus confirmed and strengthened by the prayer of our Divine Lord which is always efficacious, is commanded by Christ to confirm his brethren.

In the words of this text Christ promises an infallible teaching authority to be set up in the Church. The words are directly referred to St. Peter as head of the Church and so they refer directly to every successor of St. Peter in the Primacy. He who can confirm others so that they shall not fall into errors of faith, must himself be infallible, but the head of the Church can preserve others from falling into error, therefore he must be infallible.

There can be no doubt whatever that the words directly refer to St. Peter for he is spoken of in his own name. Besides if Christ wished to address all the Aspostle equally he would not have said *Ego rogavi pro te ut non deficiat fides tua*, he would have said *pro vobis* just as he said before *expetivit vos* when he meant that Satan was attacking the faith of all the Apostles.

That the words refer to St. Peter as the head of the Church and therefore to all his successors is clear. Because the office of confirming the faith of the pastors of the Church is the duty of a primate, and as the primacy passes to the successors of St. Peter so too does the primatial duty of confirming the faith of the pastors of the Church.

Argument from St. John chap. xxi. 15. 16. 17.

"When therefore they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter . . . feed My lambs . . . feed My sheep." In this passage there might be some room for doubt as to what is the exact meaning of *lambs*, and *sheep* taken separately; but it is certain that lambs and sheep taken together embrace the whole Church.

Our Lord commissions St. Peter, the head of the Church, to feed His lambs and His sheep, that is, all the faithful. This implies that all the bishops who are a part of the whole Church, as well as the ordinary

faithful are bound to follow Peter's teaching. He is the chief Pastor confirmed by Christ and commissioned to teach them sound doctrine, but God would not bind them to follow a guide that might lead them into error and therefore he must be Infallible in his teaching.

In the tradition of the Church we have full proof of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. It was a doctrine that was always acted upon, and acknowledged from Apostolic times, and until men should deny such a doctrine there could be no necessity for defining it.

There was an explicit declaration of the Primacy and the infallibility of the Bishop of Rome in the formulary of Pope Hormisdas to which 2,500 Eastern bishops subscribed at the time of the Acacian Schism (484-519). This shows how unquestioned was the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope both in the East and West.

In the fourth Council of Constantinople, A.D. 870, the Greek and Latin bishops subscribed to the same formulary. It is also clear from the Greek profession of faith at the second Council of Lyons, A.D. 1274, and from the definition of the Council of Florence (1438- 1442. A.D).

The following extracts from the early Fathers show what was the belief in the first ages of the Church.

Origen writes:—"It is manifest though it is not expressed, that the gates of hell will not be able to prevail either against the Church, or against Peter, because if they should prevail against the rock upon which the Church is based they would also prevail against the Church."

St. Augustine speaking of the condemnation of Pelagianism says—"Already the decisions of two Councils have been submitted to the Apostolic See and from thence rescripts (or Apostolic Letters of reply) have come to us. The cause is finished." *Roma locuta est, causa finita est, utinam finiatur et error.*

St. Cyprian says:—Men are exposed to error, because they turn not their eyes to the fountain of

truth, nor is the head sought for, nor the doctrine of the heavenly Father upheld; which thing should anyone seriously weigh, no long arguing would be necessary."

CHAPTER XIII.

The Supremacy of St. Peter proved from Scripture.

In this Chapter we shall prove that St. Peter had authority over the other Apostles and over the ordinary faithful. This authority was given by Christ Himself. It was essential to the Church that one should have supreme authority. Some people cannot see this because they have wrong ideas of what the true Church is. Jesus Christ established one Church, and while He was upon this earth He was the visible head of that Church, which is also a kingdom, and a visible kingdom, with a visible government.

When He was about to ascend up into heaven, and to leave the Church which He established, is it likely that He would leave it without some one who should govern it in His absence, some one who should represent Him, who should be His vicegerent? If a king had occasion to depart from his dominions for a long period of years would not he appoint some one to take charge of his kingdom during his absence?

Supreme authority is essential to every society. The Church is a society and every society must have a head. There must be some centre of authority, otherwise there would be no order. Can you fancy a nation without some recognized head? Certainly not. Each nation has an emperor, or king, or president, or some other recognized head; so also there must be some supreme authority in the Catholic Church. The Pope alone

claims this supreme authority and since he is the only claimant *it follows that it lawfully belongs to him.*

But some might say that Christ is the head of the Catholic Church, and since that is so we have no need of any Pope. They might as well say that God is the Father of the whole human race and therefore we have no necessity for supreme rulers in the state whether they be emperors, or kings, or presidents; we do not want magistrates of any sort; God is our Father and that is sufficient for us.

You see, then, that as a head is required for all civil governments in order to preserve unity, in the same way a head, and a visible head, is required in the Church, since it is a society bound together by the same faith and the participation of the same sacraments.

If there were no supreme head, who would appoint bishops, or assemble Councils, or settle disputes, &c. It is incongruous to suppose that in a society all should have equal authority. There must be rulers and subjects.

Some might object and say:—granted that St. Peter was appointed head of the Church but when he died his authority died with him. To speak in this way is the same as to say that when the king or queen of England dies that their authority dies with them. It is surely unreasonable to argue in this way. When the president of a republic dies, does his authority die with him? When a mayor of a town dies, do the powers which he exercised die with him?

In the Old Law there was a final court of appeal in difficult matters. The decision of the High Priest was final and those who refused to obey it were condemned to death (Deut xvii).

The Episcopal and primatial dignity were united in St. Peter.

We shall now prove from the Bible that Christ conferred upon St. Peter a primacy of honour and jurisdiction.

Papal Supremacy means that the Pope as head of the Church has authority over the other bishops as well as over the ordinary faithful. He was appointed to feed

both lambs and sheep and this power is his by divine right.

The Supremacy of St. Peter is clear from many parts of Scripture. Our Divine Lord changed Peter's name, and this was a common practice with God when He destined a person for a great office. God changed Abraham's name, and Jacob's name, &c. We shall here draw attention to another very remarkable fact and it is this that Christ conferred on St. Peter the titles which were especially given to Christ himself in Scripture. Christ conferred on Peter the title of Cephas, that is, a Rock. In the prophecies our Lord is called a rock or stone, "a stone in the foundation of Zion, a tried stone a precious stone;" and in the New Testament it is said "the stone which the builders rejected that same is made the head of the corner."

The title of Pastor is frequently applied to our Divine Lord and this title is also conferred upon St. Peter; "feed My lambs, feed My sheep."

To Peter were given the keys of the kingdom of heaven; that is, he was given supreme power in the Church. "What had the Son of God in view when he promised the keys of the kingdom of Heaven to Peter alone? *Biblical usage* and the unanimous teaching of the fathers clearly show that supreme authority is designated in the passage by the word 'keys'" (Leo XIII., *de Unitate Ecclesiae*). Under this same symbol our Lord's prerogative of highest authority is expressed in Holy Scripture; "The Holy one and the true, He that hath the key of David, He that openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth" (St. John, Apocalypse).

That Christ conferred upon St. Peter the titles which were His own peculiar titles is a strong proof that He delegated to him His own authority upon earth, making Peter and Peter's successors His perpetual Vicars, standing as it were in His place and doing duty for Him.

First Argument from Scripture:

"And Jesus answering, said to him: Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father who is in heaven.

"And I say to thee: That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

"And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven" (St. Matt. xvi. 17, 18, 19).

Christ tells us here that He will build His Church upon Peter as upon a solid rock. "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church." In the Syro Chaldaic it runs—"Thou art the rock and upon this rock I will build My Church." The abiding or lasting foundation of Peter and his sucessors in the primacy is the source of the stability of the Church. The Church will last for ever precisely because it is built upon a rock. "And I give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." He gave the 'keys' to Peter and this shows that he gave Peter supreme authority. The 'keys' of a kingdom symbolize the authority thereof. Among the Jews keys were the emblem of jurisdiction. "And whatsoever thou shalt bind," &c. This, also shows that Peter received supreme authority. Note the expressions "whatsoever thou shalt bind, whatsoever thou shalt loose." Some might object and say that we cannot draw an argument from this passage since the Fathers are divided as to the meaning of "Rock," some understanding it "Peter," some "faith," some "Christ." There is no real difference of meaning although there is a difference of expression. If we take it to mean faith the faith which is meant is Peter's faith, not faith in the abstract. Those fathers who say that the rock is Christ mean that Christ is the principal rock. According to them Christ is the Rock, but Peter is the Rock-man and is for this reason distinguished by the name Peter. Christ was to communicate to St. Peter those Rock-like qualities which are primarily in Christ Himself.

Second Argument from Scripture:

"When therefore they had dined, Jesus said to Simon Peter: Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these? He saith to him: yea Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He said to him: Feed My lambs."

"He saith to him again: Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me? He saith to him: yea, Lord Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith to him: Feed My lambs."

"He said to him the third time: Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me? Peter was grieved, because He had said to him the third time, lovest thou Me? And he said to him: Lord, Thou knowest all things: Thou knowest that I love Thee. He said to him: Feed My sheep" (St. John xxi. 15. 16.17).

Whatever might be the meaning of sheep and lambs taken separately, taken together they mean all the faithful. The expression can have no other meaning. The lambs are the ordinary faithful, the sheep are the pastors who are placed over the lambs. In a sheep-fold there are only sheep and lambs.

Peter is commissioned to feed both lambs and sheep and this involves a primacy of honour and jurisdiction; Peter is represented as the chief pastor or shepherd. Now the duty of a shepherd is to provide food for his sheep, to put them in suitable pastures and protect them from every possible danger. He has also to attend to the sheep if any of them should get sick or should any of them meet with an accident he has to nurse them, dress their wounds, &c. Peter, since he is made a chief pastor over the sheep and lambs, has to do all this, and if this does not involve superior authority it would be difficult to tell what would constitute Supremacy.

Third argument from Scripture:

"And the Lord said: Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift *you* as wheat (verse 31). But I have prayed for *thee* that thy faith fail not and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren:" we give the Latin version: *Ait autem Dominus: Simon Simon, ecce satanas expetivit vos, ut cribraret sicut triticum* (verse 31).

Ego autem rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua. Et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos (St. Luke xxii. 31 32).

In verse 31 Christ referred to the attacks of Satan on the Apostles collectively this is clear from the Latin where the plural form is used *ecce satanas expetivit vos* "Satan hath desired to have *you*."

Our Divine Lord seeing the attacks of Satan upon His Church makes provision against them. He prays that the faith of one of them should not fail. He prays for Peter and confirms him and makes him *infallible*, and being thus confirmed and made *infallible* is commanded to confirm his brethren. *Ego autem rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua.* "But I have prayed for *thee*" in the singular, not for *you*, in the plural, not for all the Apostles, nor for all the disciples in general, but for Peter especially and individually. This office of confirming the others gives Peter a supremacy over them.

Peter the confirmans is clearly distinguished from the confirmandi. The words refer to Peter as head (primate) of the Church and therefore to all his successors. For the office of confirming the faith of the pastors of the Church belongs to the duties of a primate, and as the primacy passes to the successors of St. Peter so also does the primatial duty of confirming the faith of the pastors of the Church. This office of confirming the pastors was as necessary in ages succeeding the time of the Apostles as in the Apostolic age itself.

Christ promises an infallible teaching authority to be set up in His Church. The words are directly referred to St. Peter as head of the Church and so they refer directly to every successor of Peter in the Primacy. Peter is mentioned by name *Simon, Simon.* Christ in order to safeguard the faith of the Church makes its head infallible, and commands him with his unfailing faith to confirm the others: "and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren." This certainly implies supremacy.

It is clear then that Christ committed to St. Peter the office of confirming the others in the faith.

There can be no doubt whatever that the words are directly referred to Peter for he is spoken of in his own name "Simon, Simon;" "but I have prayed for thee" (Peter). This question of the supremacy is closely connected with the question of Papal Infallibility. We shall now give a number of facts from the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles which all point to show that Peter had a supremacy of honour and jurisdiction over the other Apostles and bishops and over the whole Church.

Peter is the first to profess that Christ is God, and this he does in the name of the other Apostles. "Jesus said to them: whom do men say that I am? Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art Christ the Son of the living God" (St. Matt. xvi. 15-16).

In the lists of the Apostles Peter is always placed first "And the names of the twelve Apostles are these: 'The first Simon who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother'" (St. Matt. x. 21, St. Mark iii. 16, St. Luke vi. 14, Acts i. 13).

Peter is mentioned by name when the others are not: "But go: tell His disciples and Peter, that He goeth before you into Galilee there you shall see Him as He told you" (St. Luke xvi. 7).

Peter was the first to propose that one should take the place of Judas. "In those days Peter rising up in the midst of his brethren, said," &c. (Acts i. 15.)

On the day of Pentecost he is the first to convert the Jews (Acts ii. 14, 38, 41).

Peter is the first to admit the Gentiles into the Church. Peter spoke and gave his decision at the Council of Jerusalem and all acquiesced.

The Supremacy of St. Peter and his successors proved from Tradition.

A few passages from the very early Fathers will not be out of place here.

St. Cyprian calls the Roman Church "The chief or ruling Church, whence the unity of the priesthood has

its source." St. Irenæus (A. D. 170) speaks of the *potentior principalitas* of the Roman Church on account of which the Churches of all parts "must convene to her."

St. Ambrose says: "From the Roman Church the rights of venerable communion flow to all."

St. Augustine speaks of "the Roman Church in which the supremacy of the Apostolic See has always been in force."

St. Augustine says again: "The Apostolic See through its succession of bishops, holds the summit of authority."

St. Peter Chrysologus says: "Blessed Peter who lives and presides in his own See, gives the true faith to those who seek it, for we in our solicitude for truth and faith, cannot, without the consent of the Roman Church hear causes of faith."

St. Gregory says: "When bishops commit a fault I know not what bishop is not subject to it" (the See of Rome).

The Fathers of the Council of Nice 325 said: "The Roman Church always had the Supremacy."

The Fathers of the Council of Sardica (A.D. 347) wrote to Pope Julius I. and said: "It was most fitting that the bishops of the Lord make reference from all the Provinces to the head, that is, to the See of the Apostle Peter."

St. Prosper says: "Rome, the See of Peter, which on account of that Pastoral honour is made the head of the world."

It is sometimes objected against the Supremacy of St. Peter that he was rebuked by our Divine Lord. It is difficult to see how this could be an objection against Supremacy. If Peter committed a fault, as a Pope might, he could be rebuked by any one even by an inferior, but Peter was the subject of Christ and it is evident to all that a superior can correct one who is subject to him. As a matter of fact the incident recorded in Scripture about our Lord rebuking St. Peter has nothing to do with Papal Supremacy. They also bring forward the fact that St. Paul censured the

conduct of St. Peter when he withdrew from the Society of the Gentile converts. This was merely a point of discipline; St. Peter might have acted imprudently and St. Paul might have rightly remonstrated with him without questioning Peter's Supremacy. In the history of the Church we find often since St. Paul's time many of the strongest upholders of Papal Supremacy remonstrating with Popes without questioning that Supremacy.

CHAPTER XIV.

Peter's Supremacy passed to his Successors.

We have proved that St. Peter exercised a supremacy over the other Apostles and over the whole Church. It is for us now to show that Peter's Supremacy passed to his successors. We shall do this in four ways: (1) By examples of the exercise of Supremacy on the part of the Roman Pontiffs. (2) By extracts from the Fathers. (3) By appeals to the Roman Pontiffs. (4) By the decrees of Councils.

(1) In the first century a dissension arose in the Church of Corinth and the case was referred to Pope St. Clement who returned an answer for the instruction of the Corinthians. St. John was still living at Ephesus which is close to Corinth and still the appeal was not made to him but to the Successor of St. Peter.

Pope St. Victor I. directs the Eastern bishops as to the proper time for celebrating Easter and that they are to conform to the practice of the West.

Pope Stephen decided against St. Cyprian on the question of rebaptizing.

When the Pope sent St. Augustine to England he said to him, "We give you no jurisdiction over the Bishops

of Gaul. . . . But we commit to your care all the Bishops of Britain."

St. Patrick before he died drew up canons for the regulation of the Irish Church and in one of these canons he directs the Bishops of Ireland that if ever a case should arise which they themselves cannot settle that such a case is to be referred to the See of Rome.

(2) St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch (A. D. 114). calls Rome, "the Church all godly, all gracious, all blessed, all presiding." St. Cyprian calls the Roman Church, "the mother of all the Churches, whence Sacerdotal unity took its rise."

St. Irenæus writes of the Church of Rome: "For with this Church on account of its supremacy (*propter potentiorem principalitatem*), it is necessary that every Church, that is the faithful everywhere, should be in communion; in which Church has been preserved by the faithful everywhere the tradition which is from the Apostles."

St. Ambrose says:—"From the Roman Church the rights of venerable communion flow to all."

St. Augustine says:—"The Roman Church in which the Supremacy of the Apostolic See has always been in force." Again he writes:—"This Apostolic See through its succession of bishops holds the summit of authority."

St. Cyprian, A.D. 258, says:—That the Pope is "the fount of spiritual jurisdiction."

St. Maximus, A.D. 335, says:—"Whoever anathematizes the Roman See, anathematizes the Catholic Church."

St. Ambrose says:—"Where Peter is, there is the Church."

St. Irenæus says:—"That all the Churches and all the faithful of Christ, are bound to agree with the Roman Church on account of her superior principality."

St. Peter Chrysologus says:—"That Blessed Peter, who lives and presides in his own See gives the true faith to those who seek it. For we in our solicitude for truth and faith cannot, without the consent of the Roman Church, hear causes of faith."

Pope St. Gregory says:—"When bishops commit a fault, I know not what bishop is not subject to it" (the Roman See).

(3) St. Athanasius appealed to Pope Julius I. against an unjust decision given against him by the Eastern bishops, and the Pope reversed the decision of these bishops, and restored Athanasius to his See.

St. John Chrysostom appealed to the Pope against another decision of Eastern bishops.

St. Cyril appealed to Pope Celestine against Nestorius. Even Nestorius himself appealed to the same Pontiff. Photius who was the originator of the Greek schism wrote a letter to Pope Nicholas X. and asked him to confirm his election as Patriarch of Constantinople.

We could give many other instances of appeals being made to Rome by bishops from all parts of the world, but those we have given ought to be enough to satisfy any fair-minded man. There was scarcely a diocese in England from which appeals did not go to Rome, and were settled for ever by Rome. The fact that appeals went to Rome from bishops from all parts is a very strong proof for Papal Supremacy, because appeals always go from a lower court to a higher one, never from a higher to a lower court.

(4) The Roman Supremacy is clear from the decrees of General Councils.

In the year A.D. 252, St. Cyprian and the African bishops held a synod and sent their decrees to the Pope for approval.

The Fathers at the Council of Nice 325 said: "The Roman Church always had the Primacy."

The Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431) declared that "in all ages has it been recognized that the holy and most blessed Peter, prince and head of the Apostles, pillar of the faith, the foundation of the Catholic Church, received from our Lord, Saviour and Redeemer of the human race, the keys of the kingdom and that to him was given the power of binding and loosing sins; who even to this day lives and judges in his successors."

The Council of Sardica (A.D. 347) wrote to Pope

Julius I. that it was "most fitting that the bishops of the Lord make reference from all the Provinces to the head, that is, the See of the Apostle Peter."

The Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) which, with the exception of the two Papal Legates, was made up entirely of Eastern bishops called the Roman Pontiff, "The interpreter to all of the voice of the Blessed Peter," and they also ask him to confirm the acts of their Council. If the Pope of Rome had not supremacy it would be very strange to have Eastern bishops asking a bishop far away in the West to confirm their decrees. By the very fact of asking him to do so they acknowledge his supremacy. In fact the supremacy of the Roman See was not so much as called into question by the Eastern bishops for centuries after this time.

The same Council of Chalcedon gave expression to the saying "Peter hath spoken through Leo."

At the Council of Ephesus one of the Papal Legates spoke as follows and not one of the assembled Fathers objected. "It is doubtful to none, and has been known to all ages, that the Blessed Peter, the foundation and rock of the Church, the pillar of the faith, the Prince and the Head of the Apostles, received from our Saviour, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and that he to this moment, and always, exercises his judgment in his successors."

What could be the meaning of all this if the Pope had not universal jurisdiction? He convokes councils or consents to their convocation. He presides over them either in person or through his Legates. The decrees of these councils are sent to him for confirmation and have no binding force until they have received it. Some Canons of General Councils were even rejected by the Popes. There were a few councils and they were not general in the true sense of the word, either from want of convocation on the part of the Pope or some other cause, and became authoritative only from the fact that the Pope approved of some of their decrees.

Objectors sometimes say that the authority of the Roman Pontiff was often called in question; granted;

nothing follows from this but that there might be some ungrateful children in the Church as well as in the state.

The fact that people rebel does not prove that there is not supreme authority. If the subjects of a king rebelled would that prove that he was not king or had not supreme authority? We think not.

If children rebel against their parents does this prove that there is no such thing as parental authority? Certainly not.

CHAPTER XV.

Examples of Papal Supremacy in England.

From the time of the Conversion of the English people by St. Augustine till the Reformation, England was a Catholic land. The bishops of England sat in the Councils of the Church, held frequent communication with the See of Rome, and acknowledged its supremacy.

The Protestant Professor Freeman says: "the Church of England is the daughter of the Church of Rome. She is so perhaps more particularly than any other Church in Europe."

It might be advisible here to contrast the state of things existing in England before the Reformation with the state of things after that event.

Before the Reformation every bishop took an oath to the Holy See pledging himself "to be faithful to Blessed Peter, and to the Holy Roman Church and to our lord the Pope and his successors canonically appointed."

How different from this is the language of the Parlia-

ment of Henry VIII., "the King, his heirs, and successors, should be taken and reputed the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England, with full power to visit, reform, and correct all such errors, heresies and abuses, which by any manner of spiritual authority ought to be reformed and corrected." Lord Macaulay writes truth when he says: "The king was to be Pope of his kingdom, the Vicar of God, the expositor of Catholic verity and the channel of Sacramental graces." These are the words of a Protestant English historian and it is the duty of every honest seeker after the truth to weigh them well.

An Act in the reign of Henry VIII. also declares "Archbishops and Bishops have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by, under, or from the Royal Majesty." The Protestant bishops take the following oath: "I do hereby declare . . . . that your Majesty is the only supreme governor, of this your realm, in spiritual and ecclesiastical things as well as in temporal."

The Lord Chief Justice of England a short time ago put the whole thing in a nutshell when he said. "The Established Church is a political institution, established, created, and protected by law, absolutely dependent upon Parliament."

We shall now give a number of Protestant authorities who state emphatically that a new state of things came into existence at the Reformation.

Mr. Gardiner describing it calls it "a totally new order of things."

Sir G. O. Morgan says: "If a very bad king had not fallen in love with a very pretty woman and desired to get a divorce from his plain and elderly wife, and if he had not compelled a servile Parliament to carry out his wishes there would in all human probability, never have been an Established Church at all."

Mr. Child says of Henry VIII. "Pope of England he was, and Pope of England he remained, and so did his successors after him."

Mr. Brewer writes: "A Spiritual supremacy, an

ecclesiastical headship, as it separated Henry from his predecessors by an immeasurable interval, so was it without precedent and at variance with all tradition."

We shall now put a number of facts from the history of the Church in England which clearly show that the Supremacy of the Pope was accepted by the English people.

At the Council of Arles (A.D. 314) there were three British bishops present. It was a strange thing to have English bishops at a council in France which was settling the affairs of the Church in another part of the world. The Pope's Legate presided at that Council and the decrees of the Council were sent to Rome for approval. These British bishops did not object to the presence of the Pope's Legates, or to the sending of the decrees to Rome for approval. If a Council of the Catholic Church assembled at the present day, would the Protestant bishops claim to be present, and would they send the decrees which should be passed to Rome for confirmation? This is the question which honest Protestants have to answer for themselves.

When St. Augustine came to England the Pope sent him the following instructions: "We give you no jurisdiction over the bishops of Gaul . . . . but we commit to your care all the bishops of Britain."

Before St. Patrick died he drew up Canons for the regulation of the Irish Church. One of these says: "If the bishops of Ireland cannot agree among themselves about any case, such a case is to be referred to the See of Rome for settlement."

In the Book of Armagh one of the most ancient Irish documents we read: *Ecclesia Scotorum imo Romanorum: ut Christiani, ita et Romani sitis.* "O Church of the Irish, yea and of the Romans, as ye are children of Christ, so be ye also children of Rome."

In A.D. 1070 Archbishop Lanfranc said: "verily is it not ingrained in the consciences of all Christians that in respect to St. Peter's successors no less than himself, they must tremble at their threats, and yield joyful acclamation to their lofty graciousness."

St. Anselm in 1092 writes thus: "It is certain that he who does not obey the ordinances of the Roman Pontiffs is disobedient to the Apostolic Peter."

King Edward in A.D. 1339 wrote to the Pope as follows: "Let not the envious information of our detractors find place in the meek mind of your Holiness, or create any sinister impression of a son who, after the manner of his predecessors, shall always firmly persist in amity and obedience to the Apostolic Seat."

About 1250, Archbishop Chicheley wrote as follows to the then Pope: "Long before now, were it not for the perils of the journey, and the infirmities of my old age, I would have made my way, most Blessed Father, to your feet, and have accepted most obediently whatever your Holiness would have decided."

St. Thomas of Canterbury in a letter addressed to the Bishops of England writes:—"Whoever doubts that the Roman Church is the head of all the Churches and the source of Christian doctrine is ignorant that to Peter was given the keys of the kingdom of heaven. In the faith and teaching of Peter doth not the structure of the whole Church lie until we all attain in Christ the knowledge of the Son of God."

In A.D. 1532, Archbishop Warham declared "I neither intend to consent, nor with a clear conscience could I consent to any statute passed, or hereafter to be passed in Parliament derogatory to the rights of the Holy See."

The Bishops of England about the year 1413 when Wycliffe was causing great trouble by his false teaching asserted that "Christ retained St. Peter the Apostle as His Vicar who was to rule all Sees; and the Church of Rome, retaining the same power, it gave that title to all the successors of St. Peter, who were called the Popes of Rome."

The heads of the University of Oxford wrote to the Pope thus: "We with united hearts, undoubtedly recognize you as the Sovereign Pontiff and the Vicar of Christ upon earth, and the most true successor of St. Peter."

In 1152 the delegates of the Pope divided Ireland into

four Archbishoprics and gave the Archbishops their palliums. Why was it that the Papal delegates did this? All the Archbishops of England received their palliums from Rome and many of them went to Rome to receive them.

These are only a few out of many facts which show that the Church in England acknowledged the Supremacy of the Pope and that various communications passed between Rome and the Bishops and people of England. We invite Protestants to search up the records and they will see the foolishness of their present isolated position in the Christian Church. He would be doing a great service in the cause of truth who should collect into a pamphlet the letters or at least some of the most important of them which passed between England and Rome. If such were done it would be well to have them in the order of time and to have those of each century placed together.

CHAPTER XVI.

Was St. Peter in Rome?

That St. Peter was in Rome and was Bishop of Rome is a historical fact, for which there is abundance of proof. It was never denied until modern times, and those who deny it have no positive argument in their favour. They bring forward negative arguments which prove nothing and which must give way before strong positive arguments against them.

It will hardly be necessary to spend much time over this question, so we shall dismiss it with a few words, which shall contain at the same time sufficient proof to convince the most incredulous. We shall treat the two points together, for convenience sake.

Those who deny that St. Peter was in Rome cannot

tell us who was the first to preach the Gospel to the Romans. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans says that their faith was spoken of in the whole world, and this was before St. Paul visited Rome,

That St. Peter was in Rome and was first Bishop of Rome was believed by the whole Church both in the East and West. St. Peter was Bishop of Antioch for seven years, he lived for about twenty-five years after leaving Antioch, and if he were not Bishop of Rome they ought to be able to tell us of what place he was bishop, or where he spent his time.

Tradition says that St. Peter and St. Paul died in Rome. When a fact is universally admitted there is no necessity for giving proof of it. Nothing can be proved from the fact that St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans does not salute St. Peter. In his Epistle to the Hebrews he does not salute St. James; and St. James was in Jerusalem and was first bishop of that city. St. Peter might not be in Rome at the time, or St. Paul might have refrained from mentioning St. Peter from motives of prudence because the Christians were under persecution at Rome.

It is alleged that it is not mentioned in Scripture that St. Peter was in Rome. Granted, but nothing can be proved from this. We are not told in Scripture that St. John was Bishop of Ephesus.

Let us now come to the positive arguments which prove that St. Peter was in Rome and was Bishop of Rome.

St. Peter in his Epistle says:—"The Church that is in Babylon elected together with you, saluteth you; and so doth my son Mark." Rome on account of its wickedness was figuratively called Babylon. In this passage Babylon stands for Rome; St. Peter was never in the Babylon which is in Asia.

The ancient fathers are clear on this point.

St. Irenaeus says:—"Peter and Paul proclaimed the Gospel and founded the Church at Rome."

St. Optatus, A.D. 370 says:—"Thou cannot deny that thou knowest that in the city of Rome to Peter first the

episcopal chair was given in which sat the first of the Apostles Peter."

St. Theodore addresses the Pope thus:—"Apostolic Head, Rock of the Faith on which the Catholic Church is built! Thou art Peter who adornest and governest the See of Peter."

St. Leo says:—"The most blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostolic Order, is destined to be the bulwark of the Roman Empire."

Orosius says:—"In the beginning of the reign of Claudius, Peter, the Apostle of our Lord Jesus Christ, came to Rome, taught with faithful word the saving faith, and confirmed it with very powerful signs; from thence Christians began to be there."

St. Jerome says:—"Simon Peter goes to Rome to combat Simon Magus, he retains there the Sacerdotal Chair twenty-five years, up to the last, that is up to the year thirteen of Nero, by whom being nailed to a cross, he died a martyr with his head downward."

The Irish missionaries who were remarkable for their orthodoxy on points of doctrine converted a great portion of western Europe. St. Columbanus who was the most renowned of these fell into a dispute with some of the bishops in the north of Italy and with the characteristic outspokenness of the Celt addressed Pope Boniface IV. in a letter dated A.D. 599. "We Irish are the disciples of Peter and Paul we receive the apostolic and ecclesiastical doctrines, never hath a heretic arisen amongst us: four have arisen among you and those here are jealous. Pardon me if I have said anything offensive to pious ears. With us it is not persons but rights which are regarded. We are bound to the chair of Peter, for however glorious Rome may be it is this chair which makes it so. Although the glory of ancient Rome is spread abroad, for us you are only august and great since the Son of God and the saints Peter and Paul make you celestial. We only venerate Rome in as much as we have received faith from Rome, and are bound to the chair of Peter." In another part of the letter he says:—"I confess that I lament over the bad repute of

the chair of Peter in this Church. I speak as a friend and disciple, I speak to the Pilot and say: Watch."

Protestants admit that St. Peter was in Rome and was Bishop of Rome.

Calvin says:—"I cannot withstand the consent of those writers who prove that Peter died at Rome."

Cave, a distinguished Protestant, writes thus:—"That St. Peter was first Bishop of Rome we boldly affirm with the whole multitude of the ancients."

Chamier says:—"All the fathers with great unanimity have asserted that Peter did go to Rome, and that he did govern that Church."

Grotius writes thus:—"Ancient and modern interpreters differ about this Babylon. The ancient understand it Rome, where that Peter was, no true Christian can doubt."

Pearson writes:—"That Peter had a fixed chair at Antioch and after that at Rome is what no man who giveth credit to the ancient fathers and Councils and historians of the Church can either deny or doubt."

CHAPTER XVII.

The Temporal Power of the Pope.

What we understand by the temporal power of the Pope is that the Pope should not be the subject of any man, and if he is not a subject he must be a prince, because in social life there is no intermediate state between the condition of a subject and that of a sovereign, and real sovereignty implies the possession of territory.

The welfare of the Church requires that he should be free and independent. We do not assert that the Pope is the supreme absolute temporal ruler of the world.

This is the idea which English people generally have of what the temporal power of the Pope claims to be and this wrong idea springs perhaps from a kind of national pride peculiar to themselves.

We maintain that the Pope, the successor of St. Peter and the Vicar of Christ has spiritual jurisdiction over all Christian people, and we claim that he is the legal and rightful sovereign of the Papal States. The Pope's right to these states was as good as that which any other sovereign in Europe had to his own dominions.

He received them lawfully, and held undisputed possession of them for centuries. In the early ages benefactors made gifts to the Church. When Constantine became a Christian he was liberal in his grants, and later on Pepin made a present of the Papal States to the Pope.

To rob the Pope of these States must be looked upon in the same light as to rob any other sovereign of his possessions.

What we have to keep especially before our mind here is the right of independence of the Vicar of Christ.

Peter has care of the whole flock both sheep and lambs. He has to teach and govern the universal church. The Pope has to preserve the integrity of the faith, he has to define at times what are the truths of revelation, and to stamp out errors should they arise, &c. All this belongs to his teaching capacity.

In his capacity of governor of the whole Church, he has to govern the bishops and the faithful, to appoint new bishops where required, and to determine the limits of each diocese. He has to send Apostles to convert pagan nations that they may be brought within the fold of Christ. He has to meet bishops, to receive appeals and settle disputes. He has to treat with rulers and to defend the rights of the Church, etc. This two-fold office of teaching and ruling the whole flock would be crippled if the Pope were the subject of any power. If he were a subject the civil power could frustrate his work in these two respects. This independence which is required for the teaching and ruling of the faithful could not last long if the Pope had not some territory,

because he might be exposed to the interference or persecution of the government to which he would be subject.

The temporal power of the Pope is, in the present order of things, required for the good and free government of the Church.

The Pope is the teacher and director of the whole Catholic world. Catholics then have a perfect right of free access to him, but this could be interfered with if he were not a *Sovereign*, an independent Ruler.

This question concerns the rights of all Christian people as much and perhaps more than the Pope himself. Their rights are involved as well as his. The Pope is the Pope of all nations. He is not for the Italians alone, nor the Irish, nor the English, nor the Germans. He is not for one nation but for all nations, and all ought to have the right of free recourse to him when they wish, or when occasion requires it. But they cannot do this at all times if he has not some sovereignty. The Pope can act as Pope without temporal power, but still it is required for the free and independent exercise of his duties, and for the good government of the Church.

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Word of God. Sacred Scripture.

The word of God is divided into Sacred Scripture and Divine Tradition. We shall treat each separately. Catholics believe that the Inspired Scripture is the word of God. "All Scripture inspired of God, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct" (2 Tim. iii. 16).

Inspiration means a divine impulse moving the sacred

writer to write, and directing him to write the things which the Holy Ghost wishes him, and protecting him from error, and even the danger of error, whilst he is writing under this impulse of the Holy Spirit.

There is a two-fold grace bestowed upon the inspired writer. Enlightenment of the intellect by which the writer conceives the truths to be written.

The second grace consists in a movement of the will inducing the writer to put down in writing the truths which he had conceived by his intelligence.

The Catholic Church believes that the Books of the Bible were written under such inspiration and it believes in the whole Bible, but it does not make the Bible to be a mass of contradictions as Protestant sects do.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent says:—"Every sort of doctrine which is to be delivered to the faithful is contained in the Word of God, which is divided into Scripture and Tradition."

The Catholic Bible contains all the Canonical Books declared to be inspired by the Council of Hippo in Africa, in the year 393—and confirmed by the œcumenical Councils of Florence and Trent.

Christianity does not depend on the New Testament. The Church was established and doing its work of converting the nations before a line of the New Testament was written. The Catholic Church which is the One true Church of Christ could fulfil its mission if we had no Scriptures.

St. Irenaeus says:—"Supposing the Apostles had not left us the Scriptures, ought we not still to have followed the Ordinance of Tradition, which they consigned to those to whom they committed the Churches? It is this ordinance of Tradition which many nations of barbarians, believing in Christ, follow, without the use of letters or ink."

It is the Catholic Church which received the Bible, preserved the Bible, acknowledged the Bible as the Divine and inspired Word of God.

The Bible could not prove its own inspiration; it has no intrinsic evidence to prove its inspiration; it is re-

ceived by Christians as an Inspired Book on the authority of the Catholic and Apostolic Church.

Catholics are allowed to read the Bible. What the Catholic Church objects to is mistranslations, non-Catholic notes and prejudiced translations; but it never objected to correct and complete versions being read and scattered among the people. Several of the Popes wrote letters encouraging the reading of Scripture. That the Bible could be widely spread was impossible until the art of printing was discovered, and that it should be known was equally impossible until people learned to read, and it would be interesting for Protestants to find out how few were able to read even two hundred years after England became Protestant.

The Bible is read and taught among Catholics and they have as much veneration for it if not a great deal more than their Protestant friends. We are conscious of what a blessing we enjoy in having the Sacred Scripture and we use it to teach and above all to confirm our doctrine.

That Catholics do not read and study the Scripture is false. Students at the Catholic Colleges spend a good portion of their time in the study of Scripture. It is considered of as much importance as the study of theology. The Catholic priest reads a portion of Scripture in the Divine Office which is of daily obligation. The Sermons that are preached are full of Scripture. The greater part of the Mass is composed of portions of Scripture from the Old and New Testament.

To accuse the Catholic Church of neglecting the Scripture is unfair in the extreme. It is owing to the care of the Catholic Church that the Bible was preserved. Monks were constantly transcribing it before the invention of printing.

As truth ought to be dear to us all, honest Protestants will not blame us if we expose a few calumnies against the Catholic Church with regard to the Bible.

The first calumny is that the Catholic Church hid away the Bible and that Martin Luther was the first

to bring it forth from its place of concealment. Honest Protestant writers have shown how false is this accusation.

The Protestant Canon Dixon says:—"From the earliest times the English Church or nation was possessed of the Sacred Writings through the labours of Monks or Bishops."

And we have it on the authority of Sir Thomas More that "the whole Bible was long before Wicliffe's days, by virtuous and well-learned men, translated into the English tongue, and by godly and goodly people with devotion and soberness well and reverently read."

The Rev. E. Cutts D.D., who is a Protestant, writes;—"There is a good deal of popular misapprehension about the way in which the Bible was regarded in the Middle Ages. Some people think that it was very little read, even by the clergy; whereas the fact is that the sermons of the mediæval preachers are more full of Scripture quotations and allusions than any sermons in these days; and the writers on other subjects are so full of Scriptural allusions, that it is evident their minds were saturated with Scriptural diction."

The Bible was printed in French and Spanish about the year 1478. Three editions in Italian were printed in the year 1471 and there were about forty editions of the Bible in Italian before Luther was born. There were twenty-seven editions of the Bible in German before Luther's edition appeared.

The account given by a Protestant Journal of the Caxton Exhibition which was held in London in 1877 is to the point here. Speaking of the catalogue of early editions of printed works it says:—"This catalogue will be very useful for one thing at any rate as disproving the popular lie about Luther finding the Bible for the first time at Erfurt about 1507. Not only are there very many editions of the Latin vulgate long anterior to that time, but there were actually nine German editions of the Bible in the Caxton Exhibition earlier than 1483 the year of Luther's birth."

The Athenaeum writes:—"It is time we should

hear no more of Luther as the first German Bible translator."

The second calumny is that the Catholic Church kept the Scripture in an unknown tongue and prohibited translations of it into the vernacular. The truth is that those who could read did not care about having the Bible in the vernacular. They preferred having it in French or Latin.

The Rev. E. Cutts writes on this point :—"The truth is, that most people who could read at all could read Latin, and would certainly prefer to read the authorized vulgate to any vernacular version. But it is also true that translations into the vernacular were made."

The Catholic Church never prohibited the reading of correct versions of the Bible, but it rightly prohibited the reading and the publication of corrupt versions such as those which were made by Wicliffe, Tyndale, and Luther. These heretics accommodated the Scriptures to their errors. They added notes which contained false doctrine, &c.

The Protestant Canon Dixon writes thus :—"Every one of the little volumes containing portions of the Sacred text that was issued by Tyndale, contained also a prologue, and notes written with such hot fury of vituperation against the prelates and clergy, the monks and friars, the rites and ceremonies of the Church, as was hardly likely to commend it to the favour of those who were attacked."

Another popular lie is that Wicliffe was the first to translate the Bible into English. We have shown that this is not so. The most, if not all the Bible, was translated into English before his time.

The book of Psalms was translated into English in the first part of the fourteenth century by Richard Rolle who died in 1349. William de Schorham, a priest, also translated the Psalms about the year 1320.

It is easy to explain why there were not many copies of the Bible in the Old English tongue. They were few in any language because printing had not yet been invented ; and they were not wanted in English because

those who could read used the French language which was the language of the Parliament and of the law courts. It was only about the time of Wicliffe that English began to supersede French. When this came about nothing was so natural as that scholars should begin to translate the Bible into English in order to supply the wants of the people, and Wicliffe was only one out of many who undertook the work. It is certain that others had translated the Bible into English before Wicliffe saw the light, as Sir Thomas More says: "The whole Bible was long before Wicliffe's days, by virtuous and well-learned men, translated into the English tongue."

CHAPTER XIX.

The Word of God. Divine Tradition.

Besides the written word of God which is contained in the Bible there is also the unwritten word or Tradition; St. Paul speaks of both. "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the Traditions you have learned, whether by word or by our Epistle" (2 Thess ii. 14).

Tradition is the word of God spoken, handed down; preserved, and kept alive in the Church, but which was not committed to inspired writing. It is the authoritative, living voice of the Church. Tradition existed before the New Testament was written, and it depends upon Tradition for its authority. When the New Testament was written both existed side by side and were recognized by the Church as the rule of faith. Christ never wrote any books and many of the Apostles did not write any Epistle. They must have considered that preaching by word of mouth was a more efficacious way of converting the pagan world, and the Apostles of

Christ ever since the establishment of the Church never undertook to convert nations by giving them Bibles to read. Many nations were converted by the preaching of the Apostles; the people of these nations for the most part were not able to read, and therefore could not use the Scriptures. As we are convinced that many Protestants have a great difficulty in getting a clear idea of the meaning, and the importance of Tradition I will strive to explain it by way of an example. Here in England there is what is called the Statute Law, and the Common or Unwritten Law. Both exist, and both are recognized.

Blackstone says:—"The Municipal Law of England may be divided into the Lex non Scripta the Unwritten or Common Law, and the Lex Scripta or Statute Law." Again he says:—"If the question arises how these customs or maxims are to be known, and by whom their validity is to be determined, the answer is by the judges in the several courts of justice. They are the depositaries of the Law, the living oracle who must decide in all cases of doubt." He also calls the Common Law or the Unwritten Law, "the first ground and the chief corner stone of the Laws of England."

Mr. Freeman who is also a Protestant says;—"It is well sometimes to stop and remember how thorougly conventional the whole of our received system is. The received doctrine as to the relations of the two houses of Parliament to one another, every detail of the practical working of the Government among us, is a matter belonging wholly to the unwritten Constitution and not at all to the Written Law."

The Lex non Scripta or Unwritten Law is nothing else but tradition or the handing down of customs and usages from father to son, from one generation to another through a long series of ages.

The British Constitution relies and must rely for its authority on Tradition; in fact tradition, or the 'Lex non Scripta,' is the foundation of our Constitution. If tradition is admitted as being anterior to, and as being the foundation of the written Law of the State, why not

admit Tradition in the Church? When the Statute Law was written it did not do away with the unwritten Law. The Lex non Scripta still exists and interprets the written Law, so also the writing of Scripture did not do away with Tradition in the Church; it rather strengthened Tradition.

We have the word of God written in the Scriptures and we have Tradition to interpret and explain it. A written Law is of very little utility without some authority to decide upon it and to tell us its exact meaning.

Catholics have abundance of authority in Scripture for holding to Tradition as a part of the rule of faith. Our Divine Lord did not instruct the people by means of writing, nor did He direct His Apostles to write books and spread them among the people; on the other hand He commanded them to preach. "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature" (St. Mark xvi. 15). "But they going forth preached everywhere, the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed" (St. Mark xvi. 20).

"And the things, which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also" (2. Tim. ii. 2).

"Therefore, Brethren, stand fast; and hold the traditions you have learned, whether by word, or by our Epistle" (2. Thess. ii. 14).

The early Fathers speak clearly on this subject.

Papias says:—"If anyone came to me who had accompanied the elders, I questioned him concerning their words, what Andrew and Peter said, for I did not think that what is in the Books would aid me as much as what comes from the living and abiding voice."

St. Irenaeus says:—"Nothing is more easy to those who seek for the truth, than to remark, in every Church, the tradition which the Apostles have manifested to all the world. The tongues of nations vary, but the virtue of tradition is everywhere one and the same."

St. Ephrem says:—"Be firmly persuaded of this, not as an opinion but as a truth, that whatever has been transmitted whether in writing only, or by word of mouth,

is directed to this end that we may have life and may have it more abundantly."

St. Basil writes:—"Of the dogmas and teachings preserved in the Church, we have some from the doctrine committed to writing, and some we have received transmitted to us in a secret manner from the Traditions of the Apostles; both these have the same force in forming sound doctrine and no one who has the least experience of ecclesiastical laws will gainsay either of these. For should we attempt to reject, as not having great authority, those customs that are unwritten, we should be betrayed into injuring the gospel even in primary matters, or rather in circumscribing the gospel into a mere name."

Origen writes:—"We are not to desert our first ecclesiastical Tradition, nor to believe otherwise than as the Churches of God have, in their perpetual succession, delivered to us."

St John Chrysostom says:—"Hence it is plain that the Apostles did not deliver to us everything by their Epistles but many things without writing. These are equally worthy of belief. Hence let us regard the Tradition of the Church as the subject of our belief. Such and such a thing is a tradition; seek no farther."

St. Augustine writes:—"To attain to the truth of the Scriptures we must follow the sense of them entertained by the Universal Church, to which the Scriptures themselves bear testimony. . . . There are many things observed by the Universal Church, which are justly held to have been appointed by the Apostles, though they are not written."

St. Augustine, speaking against heretics who were abusing the Scriptures says:—"It never was, or is, or will be lawful for Catholic Christians to teach any doctrine, except that which they once received; and it ever was, and is, and will be their duty to condemn those who do. . . . They are to interpret the Divine text according to the Tradition of the Catholic Church." It remains for us to say a few words about the interpretation of Scripture, and to show that Scripture alone cannot be the Rule of Faith.

The Scripture has only one sense and that is the right sense. The Scripture cannot be made to contradict itself. Any difficulties which might arise in the interpretation of Scripture are to be solved by reference to the works of standard authors who have written on Scripture, and in doubtful points it is the office of the Church to decide.

That every one is allowed to put his own private interpretation upon the Bible is a false principle. It is this principle that has given us more than two hundred different, conflicting Christian sects all claiming to be the Religion of Jesus Christ. If every one was allowed to explain the Statute Book of England, and to interpret and administer the laws contained therein according to his own private views, what confusion would arise? Each one would in all probability decide in his own favour. But is this what is done? Certainly not. The judges in the courts interpret the laws, and those who dispute cases have to abide by their decisions. So you see that it is not enough to have the laws written down in a book; their meaning must be given by the living voice of the judges; in the same way it is not enough to have the Scripture written in the Bible, there must be some living authority to explain it, to tell us what is the correct meaning of it. This authority is the living voice of the Church, she alone can state infallibly what is the meaning of the Scriptures.

From what has already been said it is clear that the Scripture alone interpreted by private interpretation cannot be the rule of faith. If it were we should have millions of conflicting rules of faith. The difficulties into which those have fallen who have adopted this principle is sufficient proof against it. If the Bible were the sole rule of faith, how were the people saved who lived and died before the New Testament was written? or who, since it was written, were not able to read nor understand it?

It was almost four hundred years before the Books of the New Testament were collected into a single volume; during all the intervening time they were for the most part known only to particular Churches.

The two following passages put the whole thing in a nutshell. "According to the Protestant system, the art of printing would have been more necessary to the Apostles than the gift of tongues. It was well for Luther that he did not come into the world until a century after the immortal discovery of Guttenberg. A hundred years earlier, his idea of directing two hundred and fifty millions of men to read the Bible would have been received with shouts of laughter, and would inevitably have caused his removal from the pulpit of Wittenburg to an hospital for the insane" (Martinet's Religion in Society).

"Protestantism could not possibly have existed without a general diffusion of the Bible and the diffusion was impossible till after the two inventions, of paper and printing.

Clearly a religion depending upon such human invention unknown for 1400 years could hardly be considered to be the religion of Christ" (Lecky).

But it might be said that, in not allowing each individual to interpret the Scripture as he wishes, man's liberty is destroyed and he is reduced to a state of intellectual slavery. To speak in this way is much the same as to say that a man's liberty is destroyed because he is not allowed to interpret the laws of England according to his own fancy. Is a man's liberty taken away or is he a slave if the judge should give an authoritative decision against him? We should think that no man would consider himself a slave under such circumstances. Is a man a slave because he is bound to keep all the laws of his country? Is a child a slave because he has to obey his parents? Is a student a slave because he has to learn from his tutor?

CHAPTER XX.

The Veneration of Saints.

Nearly all Christians believe in the Apostles Creed, but Protestants do not realize the meaning of the article which says, I believe in the "communion of saints." The communion of saints means a mutual communication among the faithful of such things as relate to their eternal salvation. In the Catholic sense it implies that we may pray for each other. That we may ask the prayers of the saints, and that they can intercede for us with God. It also implies that we may pray for the faithful departed who are in Purgatory, and that our prayers can bring them relief. We shall treat in order of the veneration, the intercession, and the invocation of the saints; all these have been made the special subject of calumny and misrepresentation by the enemies of the Catholic Church. Ignorance and prejudice are no doubt the causes of this. We will then ask our Protestant friends to cast aside these two evils; they are no help to the acquisition of truth for which we ought all to strive. These laid aside we shall consider the matter calmly, and see what the Protestant Bible says about these doctrines that are so much reviled.

So much misunderstanding prevails on this subject that we think it well to state at the commencement the exact teaching of the Church. It is briefly summed up in the following words of the Council of Trent. "The saints reigning with Christ offer up their prayers to God for men; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, help, and assistance, to obtain favours from God through His Son Jesus Christ, our Lord who is alone our Redeemer and Saviour" (Council of Trent, Session 25).

The Council defines two points, viz., that the saints intercede for us, and that it is lawful and useful to ask their prayers. It does not even say that we are bound to ask their prayers; that is left to our own option.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent says:—"God and the saints are not to be prayed to in the same manner for we pray to God that He Himself would give us good things, and deliver us from evil things; but we beg of the saints because they are pleasing to God, that they would be our advocates, and obtain from God what we stand in need of."

The Catechism says:—"We are to honour saints and angels as God's special friends and servants, but not with the honour that belongs to God."

Every Catholic can give full assent to the following passage from the *Papist Misrepresented and Represented.* "Cursed is he who believes the saints in heaven to be his redeemers, who prays to them as such, or that gives God's honour to them, or to any creature whatsoever."

As we are fully convinced that a Canon of a Council or a quotation from a Catholic writer have very little weight with Protestants, it might be well to state that we give these quotations from authoritative sources in order to give a clear idea of what the Catholic doctrine is in reality; and to show them that after all we are not idolators. It is very strange that Catholics have been condemned for the past three hundred years for things they never believed in.

The spirit of evil must be strong which has blinded the eyes of a truth-loving people like the English for such a long period. In justice to us they should take our doctrines as explained by ourselves, not as they are misrepresented by our enemies.

If you wanted to find out whether a man was guilty of some crime you would not go for reliable information to his sworn enemy. So also here you should not go to bigots who seem to glory in vilifying the doctrines of the Catholic Church, forgetting that it was the Church of their fathers.

The words honour, veneration, worship, adoration are constantly used in theology, and it is well to remark that they are ambiguous, some of them even having with time entirely changed their signification.

All these words are sometimes applied to God, and

sometimes to men but in a different sense. Among Catholics at present the word, adore, is nearly always applied to God alone. Protestants employ the word worship and almost always restrict it to the service of God. This I think gives rise to a great deal of misunderstanding.

Since Protestants use the word worship to denote supreme or divine honour, if they hear a Catholic apply this word to the saints they are shocked and labour under the impression that Catholics are giving to the saints that honour which they should give to God alone.

Catholics seldom or ever use the word worship or adore to the saints; these are used more towards God. They employ the words, honour, venerate, &c., more generally to the saints.

We honour a magistrate or a judge, we even sometimes call the mayor of a town 'his worship' the very word that is used by Protestants to express divine honour, but surely we do not worship the mayor as God.

We honour the Queen and a person does not require much intellectual power to see that the honour we give her is higher than that given to any mayor, or magistrate or judge. People instinctively make these distinctions and give inferior or superior honour to different persons according to the dignity of the positions occupied by them, although they might use the very same word to express it.

Is it lawful then to honour the saints? It is, because the saints were possessed of excellence, and excellence should be honoured wherever it is found. The Scripture tells us: "After this I saw a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and tribes, and peoples and tongues standing before the throne and in the sight of the Lamb, clothed with white robes and palms in their hands" (Rev. vii. 9). "Then shall the just shine as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father" (St. Matt. xiii. 43).

"But shall be as the angels of God in heaven." (St. Matt. xxii. 30). Nothing is so common in the world as to hon-

our men of renown, and to hold them up for our esteem and veneration. Every nation has its heroes who are held up as models for imitation to succeeding generations. With what fond affection do the Irish people cherish the memory of the illustrious Daniel O'Connell, the Liberator of his country, a man who devoted all the energies of his mind and body to the cause of faith and fatherland, and who was ever the warm advocate of religious freedom; but the sworn enemy of tyranny and bigotry. Do not the English honour the memory of Nelson and of Wellington and raise statues to commemorate their fame. It is the same with all nations.

Now the saints are true heroes and they deserve to be honoured.—St. Paul says: "Render therefore to all men their dues. Tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour" (Romans. xiii. 7).

The saints had perfections, and they deserved to be honoured on account of them, and in honouring the saints we are honouring God who gave them these perfections. We have even the authority of the Bible for so doing. "And David said to all the Congregation, now bless the Lord your God! And all the Congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed their heads, and worshipped the Lord and the King" (1. Chron. xxix. 20).

No reasonable person can say that they gave the same honour to the king as to God, although the same word worship is used for both. Read your bible and you will meet with numbers of passages showing that it is lawful to venerate saints and angels.

CHAPTER XXI.

The Intercession of Saints.

That it is lawful to pray for each other is admitted by all. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans says. "Now I beseech you brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me" (Romans xv. 30—Protestant Version).

Catholics believe that we can pray for each other while we are yet alive, and also that we can pray to the saints and that they are able to intercede in our behalf, and assist us by their prayers before the throne of God. Protestants deny that the saints in heaven can intercede for us. Let us see what the Bible says. We shall take nothing for granted but shall give plenty of proof from the Word of God. Catholics are not afraid of their doctrines being examined to the very core. St. John in the Book of Revelation describes the saints before the throne of God praying for their earthly brethren, "And when he had taken the Book, the four beasts, and four-and-twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours which are the prayers of the saints" (Rev. v. 8—Protestant Version). In the Book of Machabees which Protestants acknowledge to be historically true, we read how Judas Machabeus before he engaged in battle with Nicanor had a vision in which he saw Onias the high priest and Jeremiah the prophet; Onias prayed with outstretched arms for the people of God and pointing to Jeremiah he said to Judas Machabeus. "This is a lover of his brethren, and the people of Israel. This is he that prayeth much for the people and for all the holy city, Jeremiah, the prophet of God" (Mac. xv. 14).

Now Onias and Jeremiah, were long since dead at the time that this vision took place, and yet they are represented as being interested in their brethren and praying for

their success in battle. We read in the Gospel (St. Luke xvi. 27.) how even Dives prayed that a messenger should be sent to his friends to warn them against hell, and if Dives who was in hell was so interested in the welfare of his friends, who can suppose that the saints cannot intercede in our behalf? Again, if the devil goes about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour (1. Peter, v. 8.) is it possible that the good angels can do nothing to protect us from peril? These passages from the Bible ought to satisfy any reasonable person that the saints in heaven can, and do intercede for their brethren on earth.

That the belief of Catholics at present was the belief of the early Church will be fully borne out by the following extracts from the Fathers of the Church in the second, third, fourth, and fifth centuries.

St. Basil in his sermon on the Forty Martyrs:—"May we be found worthy by the prayers and intercession of all the saints."

In the third century St. Cyprian says:—Let us be mindful of one another in our prayers; with one mind and one heart, in this world and in the next, let us always pray, with mutual charity relieving our sufferings and afflictions. And may the charity of him, who by the divine favour, shall first depart hence, still persevere before the Lord, may his prayer for our brethren and sisters not cease."

Origen, one of the most learned fathers of the third century, writes:—"And of all the holy men who have quitted this life, retaining their charity towards those whom they left behind, we may be allowed to say, that they are anxious for their salvation, and that they assist them by their prayers, and their mediation with God."

The belief of these early fathers was the doctrine of the Apostles and therefore the doctrine of Christ. We are not wrong in treading in their footsteps. They were faithful custodians of the truths given them by their Divine Master. It is for you now to form a judgment as to which Church is teaching the truth. Do not fear to embrace the truth for the truth will make you free.

CHAPTER XXII.

The Invocation of Saints.

In the last Chapter we proved from the Bible and the writings of the early Fathers of the Church that the saints of heaven can intercede for their brethren on earth, and obtain favours for them from God, and if that is so, nothing is so natural as to ask them to petition God in our behalf. That the saints and angels in heaven know what takes place on earth is certain. Our Saviour Himself says, that "there shall be joy before the angels of God upon one sinner doing penance." St. Luke xv. 10. When the rich glutton in hell besought Abraham to send Lazarus, "that he may dip the tip of his finger in water to cool my tongue," Abraham explained and said that he could not do such a thing, whereupon the rich man said to Abraham, "Then he said, I pray thee therefore father that thou wouldst send him (Lazarus) to my father's house for I have five brethren. That he may testify unto them, lest they should come into this place of torment, and Abraham said to him: They have Moses and the Prophets, let them hear them. And he said nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead" (St. Luke xvi. 27.-31.—Protestant Version).

Abraham therefore must have known of Moses who lived long after him.

In Tobias, which Protestants hold to be historically true, we read, "When thou didst pray with tears and didst bury the dead, and didst leave thy dinner, I offered thy prayer to the Lord." This is a clear proof that the Angel Raphael beheld the works of holy Tobias.

All that has been said in the last two Chapters about

the Veneration and Intercession of Saints should be borne in mind now when we are treating of the Invocation of Saints.

We proved in the last Chapter that we can pray for each other, and that the saints in heaven intercede for their brethren on earth: This last point in itself is enough to show that it is lawful to ask their prayers; for if the saints stand before God making intercession for their friends on earth where can be the harm in asking them to intercede for us individually. We read how Jacob asked the angel to bless his grandchildren. "The angel which redeemed me from all evil bless these lads" (Gen xlviii. 16—Protestant Version).

If the rich glutton who was buried in hell could invoke Abraham in behalf of his friends why cannot we invoke the saints in heaven?

St. John in his Revelations says: "Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which is, and which was and which is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne" (Rev. i. 4.—Protestant Bible,); here St. John prays for grace from God, and also from the seven spirits that pray before Him, which proves that we can invoke the saints and angels.

We shall now see what was the belief of the early Church with regard to the Invocation of Saints.

St. Basil in a sermon on the martyr Theodorus says:—"Invisible though thou art, come as a friend to them that honour thee; come and behold this solemn feast. We stand in need of many favours; be our envoy for thy country before our common King and Lord."

St. Ambrose says:—"The angels who are appointed to be our guardians must be invoked; and the martyrs likewise, whose bodies seem to be a pledge for their patronage. They who in their blood washed away every stain of sin, can implore forgiveness for us, they are our guides and the beholders of our lives, and actions; to them therefore we should not blush to have recourse."

St. Cyril of Jerusalem who lived in the fourth century writes:—"We next commemorate those who are gone before us; the patriarchs, prophets, Apostles and

martyrs; begging that through their prayers, God would receive our supplications."

St. Ephrem writes:—"I entreat you holy martyrs, who have suffered so much for the Lord, that you would intercede for us with Him, that He bestow His grace on us."

Origen who lived in the third century writes thus:—"I will fall down on my knees; and not presuming on account of my crimes, to present my prayer to God, I will invoke all the saints to my assistance. O ye saints of heaven, I beseech you with sorrow, full of sighs and tears, fall at the feet of the Lord of mercies for me, a miserable sinner." These passages from the early fathers speak for themselves, and reflect the teaching of the Church in the early ages.

An objection often raised against the Invocation of Saints is that it places them between God and men, making them mediators in the same way that Jesus Christ is mediator. This objection has no real foundation, because Jesus Christ is the only mediator of redemption; whereas the mediation of the saints is not a mediation of redemption, but only a mediation of intercession, and this through the merits of Jesus Christ their Divine Saviour and ours. Hence the Church ends all her prayers with these words, "through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Jesus Christ is the only mediator of redemption. He is also a mediator of intercession through His own merits; the saints are only mediators of intercession, and are such not through their own merits, but through the merits of Christ.

In this sense any person who prays for his neighbour may be said to be a mediator. The word has different meanings. Moses was a mediator between God and His people. "I stood between the Lord and you" (Deut, v. 5.—Protestant Bible).

We ask favours of the saints not through their own power independently of God; but through the merits of Jesus Christ our Lord, and this does not interfere with the one mediatorship of our Saviour, no more than

we when we pray for our friends. To sum up, the worship we give to God and the saints is entirely different, differing not only in degree but in kind. We do not give supreme or divine honour to any saint or angel or to the Blessed Virgin. A Catholic would be condemned as a heretic if he did so. Christ is the one mediator of redemption, and the fountain of salvation, and of all graces, we can obtain nothing independently of Christ from any saint or angel.

It is lawful for us to venerate and to invoke the saints because they were great servants of God, and highly favoured by Him; we have plenty of authority in the Bible for these practices. But we are not bound to have recourse to the saints; why not then go at once to Christ? I refer you to your Bible. We do pray directly to Christ; the mistake that Protestants make is in thinking that we cannot do this, and that we always employ the saints as mediators, thereby honouring the saints more than God. We can go at once to Christ but as we poor Catholics acknowledge ourselves sinners, we think it well to get the saints, the special friends of God to intercede for us.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Relics.

Relics are things that once formed a part of, or appertained to persons of eminent sanctity, and are now venerated with a certain amount of respect; as for instance the cross on which our Lord died, or the remains of saints or martyrs or parts of their bodies or their garments, &c., are relics.

As you love your Bible you no doubt will like to hear a few passages from its sacred pages with regard to

relics, "And Joshua rent his clothes, and fell on the earth upon his face, before the ark of the Lord until the eventide, he and the elders of Israel, and put dust upon their heads" (Joshua vii. 6—Protestant Bible). Did it ever strike you before why Joshua fell down before the Ark? It was simply because the Ark was a relic and was held in respect by Joshua. Let us take another example from the Bible. "And it came to pass, as they were burying a man, that, behold they spied a band of men; and they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha: and when the man was let down, and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and stood up on his feet" (2 Kings xiii. 21—Protestant Bible). The bones of Elisha were relics and you see by your inspired Bible that because Elisha was a holy man, his bones had properties which the bones of ordinary persons had not. They were relics, and so great was their power that when a dead man touched them he came back to life.

The mantle of Elijah is another example of relics, "And he took the mantle of Elijah that fell from him, and smote the waters, and said, where is the Lord God of Elijah? And when he also had smitten the waters they parted hither and thither: and Elisha went over" (2 Kings ii. 14, Protestant Version).

On another occasion the only child of a widow died and the people knowing the power of Elisha asked him to come and bring it back to life; Elisha did not care to go himself but sent his man saying, "Take my staff and lay it upon the face of the child." So we see that even in these remote times relics were capable of doing great things.

But let us come to the New Testament and search for something about relics. "And behold, a woman which was diseased with an issue of blood twelve years, came behind Him and touched the hem of His garments (St. Matt. ix. 20, 21, 22—Protestant Bible). OurLord's garment was as a relic and it is clear from the passage that it had great power.

In the Acts of the Apostles we read a good deal about relics and their efficacy. "In so much that they brought

the sick into the streets and laid them on beds and couches, that at least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them" (Acts v. 15—Protestant Bible).

Again it says:—And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul; so that from his body was brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them" (Acts xix. 11-12—Protestant Version).

Protestants are continually saying that the respect which we have for relics is superstition. If there is superstition in the above passages of Sacred Scripture Catholics are willing to be accounted superstitious.

The writings of the Fathers are very clear on this subject, so clear that no one can mistake their meaning. The life of St. Polycarp, who was himself a disciple of St. John, furnishes a good example. St. Polycarp was Bishop of Smyrna, and he was so much respected during life for his sanctity that after his death it was suggested by the enemies of the Christians that his remains should be worshipped. The Christians of Smyrna seeing through this evil design write as follows: "Foolish men! who know not that we can never desert Christ, who died for the salvation of all men; nor worship any other. Him we adore as the Son of God; but we show deserved respect to the martyrs, as His disciples and followers. The centurion, therefore, caused the body to be burnt. We then gathered his bones, more precious than pearls, and more tried than gold, and buried them."

St. Chrysostom speaking of St. Ignatius Martyr says:—"When, therefore, he had there (at Rome) laid down his life or rather when he had gone to heaven, he returned again crowned. For the goodness of God was pleased that he should return to us, and to distribute the martyrs between the cities. For that city received his dropping blood, but you have honoured his relics."

St. Basil writes:—"Affection to our departed brethren is referred to the Lord, whom they served; and he who honours them, that died for the faith, shows that he is

inspired by the same ardour; so that one and the same action is a proof of many virtues."

St. Ephrem writes thus:—"See how the relics of the martyrs still breathe! Who can doubt of these martyrs being still alive? Who can believe that they have perished? For the Deity dwells in the bones of the martyrs, and by His power and presence miracles are wrought."

St. John Chrysostom says:—"That which neither riches nor gold can effect, the relics of martyrs can. Gold never dispelled diseases, nor warded off death: but the bones of the martyrs have done both."

St. Jerome in the following passage brings out the Catholic doctrine on this point:—"We worship not, we adore not, the relics of the martyrs;—but we honour them, that our minds may be raised to Him, whose martyrs they are. We honour them that this honour may be referred to Him, who says: He that receiveth you, receiveth Me."

From the above passages of Sacred Scripture, and the writings of the early fathers we have plenty of authority for paying a certain honour to relics.

Protestants honour great men while they are yet alive, and honour their memories after death: no disrespect is allowed to be paid to their remains, and things that belonged to them are preserved with care, sometimes even in glass cases; and are often sold at a big price. Visit the hospitals and museums in London and you will see plenty of relics. These relics are the remains of the heroes of the world. The saints are the heroes of the Catholic Church, and you ought not to deny to them a privilege which you concede to others. You deny the saints a right which you are willing to grant to every great man. The remains of the great men of this world are relics and are honoured by you; and if you honour their relics why cannot we honour the relics of the saints of God's Church. The principle is exactly the same. You might say that you do not claim the power of working miracles for your relics; neither do we claim any power for our relics considered independently of God, but God

can and does bestow a power upon them. Read the above passages of Scripture and you will see that He has done so in the past, and can do so in the future.

You might also say that you do not worship relics. Catholics would ask you to prove that they worship them with undue honour. Catholics would be condemned as heretics by the Church if they worshipped either relics or images unduly.

If Protestants see Catholics kneeling before images, they without any reason conclude that Catholics worship images and relics as if they were possessed of some divine power. How unreasonable is this! If poor simple Catholics strong in the faith find that they can pray better, and are filled with holier thoughts when they pray before a crucifix than otherwise, are not they as free to do so as a Protestant is to go to a certain church which takes his fancy, and where he feels he can pray better than he could in another place.

A Catholic whether learned or ignorant would not say that such a Protestant adored the walls of that church.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Images.

By holy images we understand representations of Christ and his saints, or of scenes from Scripture, &c. It is difficult for Catholics to understand what objection Protestants have to images; they have them in their own houses and churches, and there does not seem to be much doubt but that their reason for having them is the same as ours, viz., to honour the persons represented, and to inspire the heart to imitate their virtues, or their heroism.

Protestants although they have images do not adore them, neither do we.

Catholics find that images and paintings remind them of God and His saints, and can see no solid reason why they should not be allowed to use them. Since some Protestants still persist in saying that Catholics adore images we shall give our doctrine as explained in the Council of Trent. "The images of Christ and of His Virgin Mother, and of other saints, are to be had and retained, especially in churches, and a due honour and veneration is to be given to them: not that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, for which they are to be honoured, or that any prayer is to be made to them, or that any confidence is to be placed in them, as was formerly done by the heathens, who placed their hopes in idols; but because the honour which is given to them, is referred to the originals, which they represent; so that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our heads or kneel, we adore Christ, and venerate his saints whose likeness they represent" (Council of Trent, session, 25). You might say that God's commandment ought to be obeyed "Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, nor on the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth, thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them. I am the Lord thy God, mighty and jealous" (Ex. xx. 4). If this text forbade absolutely the making of images or the use of paintings Protestants would be as guilty as Catholics.

The meaning evidently is that God forbids the making of images to be adored after the manner of the Pagans. That this is the meaning is clear from other parts of Sacred Scripture, because their use was even commanded by God. God said to Moses: "Thou shalt also make two cherubim of beaten gold, on the two sides of the oracle; let one cherub be on the one side, and the other on the other: let them cover both sides of the propitiatory (or mercy seat) spreading their wings and covering the oracle" (Exodus xxv. 18).

We have also the command of God to Moses "The Lord said to Moses, make a brazen serpent, and set it up for a sign, whosoever being struck (with the fiery serpents,) shall look on it, shall live" (Num. xxi. 8). When Solomon built the temple there were images in the walls "he graved cherubim on the walls" (2 Chron. iii. 7).

If you read your Bible you will find many other passages where the use of images is not only allowed but even commanded by Almighty God.

A Protestant woman who was very strong against images once spoke to me in the following manner "What foolish people Catholics are! They have saints and images and relics, they spend all their time with these things and never think of Christ." I attempted to argue with her but it was in vain. I pointed to her chimney piece on which was a small statue; she said it would not be there if she had her way." Well I said, "there are many statues in every large town in England." She had an answer for this—"they are no saints—they are statues of men, and the people do not bow their heads to them nor take off their hats when they come before them." "But there is a chair in London," I said, "and the people take off their hats and bow to it." "That is all right enough," she said, "that is the Queen's chair." At length I told her that God commanded the use of images in the Bible; she answered by saying that there is nothing about images in the new Testament, "let us believe in the Lord and we shall be saved."

This is the manner of arguing which many Protestants adopt and it is easy to see that the logic is about as bad as it could be.

We cannot refrain from quoting the following passage from Cardinal Wiseman. "The whole question, then, turns upon this: whether the Catholics are justified in making use of them as sacred memorials, in praying before them, as inspiring faith and devotion. I may be asked what warrant there is in Scripture for all this? I might answer that I seek none; for rather I might ask, what authority there is to deprive me of such objects, because it is a natural right to use any thing

towards promoting the worship of God, which is not in any way forbidden. I might as well be asked, what warrant there is in Scripture for the building of churches, for the use of the organ, for the ringing of bells, for music, or for a thousand other things that appertain to the worship of the Church.

"Do I want a warrant; do I require Scripture for the use of the organ? certainly not; because if the thing is innocent, and serves to raise our hearts towards God, we consider that we have a right to use it, and nothing but a positive enactment can deprive us of it" (Lectures on the Church).

Images serve many useful purposes. They are ornaments to our Churches. Solomon decorated the temple with images, "and he overlaid the Cherubim with gold. And all the walls of the temple round about he carved with divers figures and carvings" (3 Kings vi).

Images and paintings are to the ignorant what books are to the learned. By their means ideas can be conveyed to the mind just as well as by books or lectures. If images and pictures were of no use why are the advertising stations full of them? It is certain that if they did not serve some useful purpose shrewd Protestant Englishmen would not have recourse to them as a means by which they could advertise their wares.

They also help our devotion, reminding us of Christ and His saints. Who can look upon the Stations of the Cross without being moved to sympathize with the sufferings of our sorrowing Saviour?

If it is lawful to erect statues to men who are dead, why not have statues of saints? Could we not say that Protestants are inconsistent when they condemn us for doing what they themselves do.

Remember then that Catholics give only a relative worship to images. That it is lawful to give them an inferior honour; that is an honour which is referred back to the originals which they represent. The honour is not given to the wood or stone or metal of which the image is made. There can be no harm in this kind of honour being given to images, relics, &c; Protes-

tants give this kind of honour to the photos and oil-paintings of their friends.

We are not bound by the Church to have images or paintings of any sort. They form no essential part of our religion.

It would be wrong to disrespect the images of Christ and His Saints, just as Protestants would consider it wrong if a rude, ignorant person abused or destroyed one of their family oil-paintings. Protestants can be fully convinced that Catholics are orthodox in their use of images, and that they neither worship them nor serve them. Every Catholic can say: "Cursed be he who commits idolatory, that prays to images or relics or who worships them for God" (The Papist Misrepresented and Represented).

CHAPTER XXV.

Indulgences.

In treating of Indulgences we shall say a few preliminary words by way of explanation. In mortal sin there is the guilt, the eternal punishment, and the temporal punishment. Indulgences have nothing whatsoever to do with the guilt or the eternal punishment. They have to do only with the temporal punishment.

The temporal punishment can remain after the guilt is pardoned and the eternal punishment is remitted, and it must be satisfied for, either in this world or in the next. See the next chapter on Purgatory where this is explained and fully proved.

The penitent satisfies the temporal punishment by works of penance which in ancient times were called canonical penances from being regulated by certain fixed rules. The length and rigour of these canonical pen-

ances varied according to the nature and circumstances of sins, lasting sometimes only for forty days, and at other times extending to three, seven, and ten years, and in exceptional cases, for enormous crimes, even to a whole life time.

In ancient times there were public penances for public sins. There was forgiveness in the Sacrament of Penance from the guilt and eternal punishment; but forgiveness in the face of the Church only when the penitent had completed the canonical penance which was intended to satisfy the temporal punishment, and to repair the scandal which was given to the faithful. It is well to remember that an Indulgence refers only to the outward guilt, and if an Indulgence is said to forgive sin this has reference only to the remission of the temporal punishment, or to that with which the canonical penance had to deal.

Another point which it is very important to bring out clearly is that an Indulgence does not forgive the guilt even of venial sin. This guilt is forgiven either by the Sacrament of Penance, or by acts of sorrow, or acts of the love of God, or almsdeeds, &c.

That abuses occurred in the past with regard to Indulgences, Catholics do not deny. What is so sacred as to be exempt from abuse? The existence of abuses does not prove that the doctrine is wrong. If bad subjects violate the laws of England, e.g., if they rob or kill, does that abuse prove that the law does not exist, or that the law is bad or unjust? If bad children disobey their parents and set at nought parental authority does such an abuse do away with the legitimate rights and obligations of parents? or does it follow that the authority of parents is unlawful or wrong? If a Catholic priest were so bad, and so far forgot his sacred calling as to sell an Indulgence for money it does not follow that his action is in accordance with the teaching of the Catholic Church, or that the doctrine of Indulgences is false on that account. The love of filthy lucre induced men to do many things that were wrong. It induced Judas to betray our Lord, but no one will say that because Judas

did that bad act, that the doctrine of Christ was false, His claims unfounded, or His mission an imposture.

The word indulgence has never changed its technical meaning though the same word is now used of persons who allow themselves to be carried away by their passions. In theology it has retained its original meaning, it is well to remember this point because it has given rise to misunderstanding.

The Catholic doctrine about Indulgences has been so much misrepresented that we feel it our first duty to state what an Indulgence is not. An Indulgence is not a pardon for any kind of sin whatsoever, nor is it a licence to commit sin. The proof for this is in the fact that the first condition for the gaining of an Indulgence is that the person should be in the state of grace. It is very unfair and uncharitable for Protestants to say that we hold doctrines which we ourselves would condemn as false. Why are they so fond of misrepresenting us? In justice to us and to our faith, a faith which was that of their own fathers for more than a thousand years, they ought to take the trouble to learn exactly what we do believe, and not to condemn us wrongfully on the misrepresentations of others. Certainly this is not demanding too much from them, for who can know better what we believe than we ourselves.

If a man were accused of a crime, no reasonable person would go to his sworn enemies for reliable information as to his innocence or guilt. Protestants do not often really apprehend Catholic doctrines. They would be right in condemning us if our doctrine in this case were what they often say it is. An Indulgence then is not a pardon for sin of any kind whatsoever, whether past, present, or to come, nor is it a licence to commit sin in the future. It has to do only with the temporal punishment and its expiation.

An Indulgence is the remission of a portion or the whole of the temporal punishmeut due to sin after the guilt and eternal punishment are remitted.

The doctrine of Indulgences is grounded on the fact that satisfaction must be made for the temporal punish-

ment due to sin after the guilt and eternal punishment are forgiven in the Sacrament of Penance, and that the Church can change or relax that penance in certain cases, an equivalent being given from the treasury of the Church.

For example it accepts the sufferings of the martyrs as an equivalent for the penance of some; these superabundant works and merits of saints and martyrs of course deriving their efficacy from the merits of Christ. An example from civil affairs will help to show that the Church has power to change or relax the penance imposed in order to satisfy for the temporal punishment due to sin. A magistrate is often justly lenient to a criminal if he confesses his guilt and expresses his sorrow for his crime, or if he has deserved well of the State owing to his past services, or even if other men who deserve well of the State intercede for him.

Take another example. A criminal is condemned to twenty years penal servitude. During his prison life he behaves himself well and is let off on a ticket of leave when he has completed ten years. This is an Indulgence on the part of the State. Let us take another example. A rude ignorant man insults a gentleman without any cause. That gentleman might forgive the ignorant person, if a friend for whom he had great respect were to ask him to do so.

The principle underlying the Catholic doctrine of Indulgences is of frequent occurrence in every day life.

That the Church has power to diminish the temporal punishment or to change it, an equivalent being given, or in other words to grant an Indulgence, is sufficiently deducible from the Bible:—Christ said to St. Peter, "And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven" (St. Matt. xvi. 19.—Protestant Version).

Our Divine Lord said to His Apostles: "Peace be unto you, as My Father hath sent Me, even so I send you. And when He said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosesoever sins

ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain they are retained" (St. John xx. 21, 22, 23. —Protestant Version).

What ample powers are given to the Church in these texts. The Apostles received power to forgive sin itself; surely the Church has the lesser power of remitting or relaxing the penance imposed as a temporal punishment for sin when an equivalent is given.

We have examples of Indulgences in the Bible. St. Paul granted an Indulgence to the incestuous Corinthian. This man committed a great sin. The Christians of Corinth on the advice of St. Paul punished him severely (probably by excommunication).

"For I verily as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ. To deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. v. 3, 4, 5.—Protestant Version).

From this passage it is clear that a severe penance was imposed, which penance was intended to save the soul by inflicting pain upon the body. From verse four it also appears that the penance imposed was not intended to remit the guilt or the eternal punishment because it was imposed by the congregation. "When ye are gathered together" (verse 4).

To forgive or retain sin does not belong to the ordinary faithful. The penance imposed must then be intended to bring this man to a sense of the enormity of his crime, and to repair the scandal which he had given to his fellow Christians.

This punishment had the desired effect; the sinner is convinced of the enormity of his crime, and is full of sorrow, sorrow so great that his condition became the cause of alarm. The Corinthians and St. Paul hearing of this, revoke the sentence, accepting his great sorrow in payment of the part of the penance which yet remained to be performed. In his second Epistle to the

Corinthians St. Paul writes thus about the man in question:—"Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted of many. So that contrariwise you ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him, lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow. Wherefore I beseech you that ye would confirm your love towards him. For to this end also did I write, that I might know the proof of you, whether ye be obedient in all things. To whom ye forgive anything I forgive also: for if I forgave anything, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it in the person of Christ. Lest Satan should get an advantage of us." (2 Cor. ii. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.—Protestant Version).

From this it is evident that St. Paul accepted the great sorrow of the man, as also the virtues of the good Corinthians as an equivalent of what remained to be performed of the penance formerly imposed. And since the punishment (whatever it was), was imposed that he might by its means save his soul, it would not do to remove it unless the same effect would follow after it was relaxed; otherwise it would be endangering his eternal salvation, a thing which St. Paul would not do. Therefore the great sorrow of the man was accepted by St. Paul as an equivalent. It is a matter of no consequence what was the penance imposed by St. Paul.

The relaxation that took place in this case was an Indulgence in the Catholic sense, and what the Church could do in the days of St. Paul, it could do ever since, because it is in every age the Church of Christ and has the same power in every age. "Behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world."

The Church imposes a penance as a satisfaction for the temporal punishment due to sin. That penance if well performed does away with the temporal punishment or in other words satisfies for it either in whole or in part. The Church claims that it can be satisfied by an equivalent performed by the penitent himself or by others, as for example if the penitent shows extraordinary signs of sorrow, and a strong resolution to avoid sin

for the future, or if holy persons performed works of mercy and penance in behalf of the sinner. That this is so is manifest from the above passage of St. Paul as also from the writings of the early fathers of the Church.

St. Basil says:—"He who has the power of binding or loosing can lessen the time of penance to the truly contrite."

The Council of Nicea prescribes as follows:—"In all cases the disposition and character of repentance must be considered. For they who by fear, by patience, and good works, manifest a sincere conversion, when they shall have passed over a certain time and begun to communicate in prayer with the faithful, to these the bishop may show more Indulgence, but not to those who manifest indifference, and think it enough that they are allowed to enter the Church. They must complete the whole period of penance."

A strong proof for Indulgences is in the fact that the sufferings of those who were about to undergo martyrdom, in the early days of the Church, were accepted as an equivalent for the canonical penances. Those who were undergoing canonical penances were accustomed to go to those of the faithful who were in prison awaiting martyrdom from whom they used to obtain a recommendation to mercy. These penitents were immediately absolved from the remainder of their penance; the Church accepting the sufferings of those who were soon to lay down their lives for their Divine Master as an equivalent for the remainder of the canonical penance imposed upon these sinners.

Tertullian speaks of this practice thus:—"Which peace some not having in the Church, are accustomed to beg from the martyrs in prison and therefore ye should possess and cherish, and preserve it in you, that so ye may perhaps be able to grant it to others."

The fact that Tertullian afterwards denied the efficacy of this practice when he joined the Montanists is only another proof that the practice existed.

When he embraced the errors of that strict sect he wrote:—"Let it suffice for a martyr to have purged

his own sin, it is the part of a proud, ungrateful man to lavish upon others that which he hath himself obtained at a great price."

St. Cyprian having this practice before his mind writes thus:—We believe that the merits of the martyrs and the works of the just can do much with the best judge. . . . But to this you should diligently attend, that you designate by name those to whom you wish peace to be given." From this it is evident that the Church accepted the superabundant merits of the martyrs as an equivalent for a part of the canonical penances imposed. This was certainly the practice of the early Church and as it was accepted and adopted by the Church and the Fathers it must be true. To sum up, an Indulgence is not what Protestants believe it to be, it is not a pardon for sin of any kind, nor a licence to commit sin. It comes into effect only after the guilt and eternal punishment of mortal sin are forgiven in the Sacrament of Penance; and is a remission of a portion or the whole of the temporal punishment due to sin.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Purgatory.

The teaching of the Catholic Church is that there are three states in the other life. Heaven where those go who die having no sins upon their souls; hell to which those who die in mortal sin go for ever and ever. They, the wicked, the Sacred Scripture tells us, shall go into everlasting fire "where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched" (St. Mark ix. 44). There is also a middle state where those go who die having venial sins

upon their souls, or who have not expiated the temporal punishment due to their mortal sins.

In order to help us to understand the doctrine and the necessity of a middle state let us consider mortal sin for a moment. In mortal sin we can consider three things, the guilt, the eternal punishment, and the temporal punishment. The guilt of mortal sin consists in its being a rebellion and ingratitude against God. The eternal punishment due to mortal sin is the everlasting fire of hell. Left to ourselves we could not make reparation for the guilt and the eternal punishment of mortal sin; man left to himself could never rise from the state of grievous sin to that of sanctifying grace; such a change must be the work of the grace of God. Nevertheless man can make a little reparation to God for the injury done Him by sin and God expects that this reparation shall be made. It is within the power of man and he ought to perform it in order to show his willingness to satisfy God's justice. This reparation that man can and ought to make is what is called the temporal punishment due to mortal sin. It can remain after the guilt and eternal punishment are forgiven; as in the case of David. God forgave him his sin but inflicted temporal punishment by decreeing the death of his child. If not satisfied during life the soul will have to suffer for it in Purgatory.

Purgatory means a place or a state, where some souls suffer for a time, for their small sins and imperfections, and are purified from their stains, before they can enter heaven. You might say that the name does not occur in Scripture, and that therefore it must be rejected. There is very little in the name, the doctrine is more than the name, we could call it just as well a middle state, or an intermediate state. The word does not occur in Scripture neither does the word, Trinity, Incarnation, Consubstantial, and still you believe the doctrines expressed by these words.

All that Catholics are bound to believe about Purgatory is briefly summed up in the following words of the Council of Trent, "There is a Purgatory and the souls

detained there are helped by the prayers of the faithful and particularly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar" (Council of Trent, Session 25).

The Church does not say where Purgatory is, nor does it bind us to believe that the punishment is material fire, although the language of Scripture seems to imply that the suffering shall be by fire. We are only bound to believe that there is such a place or state, and that the souls there can be assisted by our prayers and good works.

The souls in Purgatory cannot help themselves; their time for merit is past and gone. Those go to Purgatory who die in venial sins unrepented of, or who have not satisfied the temporal punishment due to their mortal sins.

It is no part of the doctrine of the Catholic Church that all souls go to purgatory. Some may be so good as to go directly to heaven. Purgatory is not therefore a necessity for all. Neither does it say how long souls shall be detained there; it is reasonable to suppose that their sufferings depend upon the number of their venial sins, and the amount of temporal punishment left unpaid at the moment of death.

We shall now prove the doctrine of Purgatory from reason, Sacred Scripture, and Divine Tradition.

The Doctrine of Purgatory proved from Reason.

First Argument from reason: If we admit prayers for the dead we must admit a middle state, because it would be useless to pray for the dead if they could not be relieved by our prayers. The souls in heaven do not want our prayers, and they can bring no relief to the damned, therefore our prayers must be intended for those in a middle state, where they can be benefited by them. The Jews always prayed for the dead, and our divine Lord never censured them for this practice. All Christians except Protestants pray for the dead; this goes to show that it is lawful and useful to pray for them, and that they can be assisted by our prayer.

Second Argument from reason: It is the teaching of Scripture that those wicked persons, who die in mortal sin go to hell for ever and ever; and that those who die having no sins upon their souls and no temporal punishment unpaid go directly to heaven. But suppose a person dies having small sins upon his soul. Where will he go to? To say that he would go to hell is monstrous! such would be against the justice and the mercy of God. Neither can he go immediately to heaven, because the Sacred Scripture tells us that nothing defiled can enter heaven. If you consider who God is and what heaven is you will see the reasonableness of this; a soul in such a condition must then go to some middle state to suffer for a time and to be purified from its stains. Take for example the case of a child who tells a lie of excuse, or of a person who steals a penny, and dies in a moment without any time for repentance, no one would say that such a person deserves the same punishment as a murderer.

The Doctrine of Purgatory proved from the Bible.

First Argument from Scripture: "Agree with thine adversary quickly whilst thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing" (St. Matt. v. 25-26—Protestant version).

We shall draw our argument from the last part of this text; "Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing."

There is a going out mentioned here; that going out cannot refer to hell because there is no going out from that place, it is a place of eternal torments. Neither does the going out refer to heaven, because the souls do not want to go out from there, and moreover there is no pain going on in that place of bliss. The going out

then must refer to a middle state where souls suffer for, and are purified from their small sins and imperfections.

Second Argument from Scripture: "And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him neither in this world, neither in the world to come" (St. Matt. xii. 32—Protestant Version).

Here our Divine Lord says that those who speak against the Holy Ghost shall not receive pardon either in this world or in the world to come; thereby showing that some sins are forgiven in the world to come. St. Augustine commenting on this text says that if no sin can be forgiven in the world to come the whole argument of Christ loses its force.

Third Argument from Scripture: "Now he that planteth and he that watereth are one: and every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labour. . . . For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble. Every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day of the Lord shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire" (1 Cor. iii. 8-15—Protestant Version).

Here St. Paul contemplates the case of a man who built a superstructure of good works (gold, silver and precious stones) on the true foundation Jesus Christ; but who has also some imperfections (wood, hay and stubble). St. Paul says, that, that man shall receive the reward of his virtues, but that he shall suffer for a time for his imperfections, eventually saving his soul, "but he himself shall be saved yet so as by fire." That this is the manifest meaning of St. Paul's words is clear from the comments of many of the early Fathers on this very text.

St. Ambrose says:—"Take care that you carry not with you to the judgment of God either wood or stubble which the fire may consume. Take care lest, that having one of the things that may be approved, you at the same time have much that may give offence. If any man's work shall be burnt he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved yet so as by fire (1 Cor. iii. 15). Whence it may be collected, that the same man is saved in part, and condemned in part."

Origen commenting on this passage of St. Paul's Epistle says: "Which words manifestly show that there are some sins so light as to be compared to stubble, to which, when fire is set, it cannot dwell long, that there are others like to hay, which the fire easily consumes, but a little more slowly than it does stubble; the others resemble wood, in which, according to the degree of criminality, the fire finds an abundant substance on which to feed."

Again Origen writes:—"When we depart this life, if we take with us virtues or vices, shall we receive reward for our virtues, and those trespasses be forgiven to us which we knowingly committed; or shall we be punished for our faults, and not receive the reward of our virtues? Neither is just because we shall suffer for our sins, and receive the reward of our good actions. For if upon the foundation of Christ you shall have built not only gold, and silver, and precious stones, but also wood and hay and stubble, what do you expect when the same shall be separated from the body? Would you enter into heaven with your wood and hay and stubble to defile the Kingdom of God; or on account of these incumbrances, receive no reward for your gold and silver and precious stones. Neither is this just. It remains then for you to be committed to the fire which shall consume the light materials; for our God, to those who can comprehend heavenly things, is called a consuming fire. But this fire consumes not the creature, but what the creature has himself built—wood, and hay, and stubble. First therefore, we suffer on account of our transgressions and then we receive our reward."

From these remarks it is not difficult to see that the Fathers had the above passage of St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians before their mind.

Fourth Argument from Scripture: "Judas, making a gathering, he sent twelve thousand drachmas of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered up for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection . . . . and because he considered that they who had fallen asleep, with godliness had great grace laid up for them. It is therefore, a holy and a wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins" (2 Mach. x. 43, 46). Protestants admit this Book to be historically true. Now the above passage proves that the Jews believed in a middle state where souls suffer on account of their sins, and that our prayers can assist them, otherwise we should be recommended to do a useless thing.

In all the liturgies used by the Oriental Christians, there are forms of prayer for the dead; in substance the same as the following memento taken from the Catholic missal. "Be mindful, O Lord of thy servants and handmaids, who are gone before us, with the sign of Faith, and sleep in the sleep of peace. To these, O Lord, and to all that rest in Christ, grant we beseech thee, a place of refreshment, light and peace. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen."

We shall now give a few extracts from the early Fathers.

The Doctrine of Purgatory proved from the writings of the Fathers.

Tertullian says:—"Among the Apostolic traditions received from our fathers, we have oblations for the dead on the anniversary days."

St. Augustine says:—"Nor is it to be denied that the souls of the departed are relieved by the piety of their living friends, when the Sacrifice of the Mediator is offered for them, or alms are given in the Church."

Again he writes:—"Through the prayers and sacri-

fices of the Church, and almsdeeds, God deals more mercifully with the departed than their sins deserve."

St. Chrysostom writes:—"It was not without good reason ordained by the Apostles, that mention should be made of the dead in the tremendous mysteries, because they knew well that these would receive great benefit from it."

St. Cyprian says:—"It is one thing to be waiting for pardon, another to attain to glory, one thing to be sent to prison not to go from thence till the last farthing is paid, another to receive immediately the reward of faith and virtue, one thing to suffer lengthened torments for sin and to be chastised and purified by fire, another to have cleansed away all sin by suffering."

St. Cyril of Jersusalem says:—"Then we pray for the holy fathers and the bishops that are dead; and in short for all those who are departed this life in our communion, believing that their souls receive very great relief from the prayers that are offered for them, while the holy and tremendous victim lies upon the altar. This we will show you by an example. For I know there are many who say. 'What good can it do a soul which is departed out of this life, whether with sins or without them, to be remembered in this sacrifice?' But tell me I pray you, if a king had sent into banishment some persons who offended him, and their friends should present him with a crown of immense price, to appease his anger, might not the king, on that account, show some favour to the guilty persons? So do we address our prayers to God for those that are dead, though they were sinners; not by presenting to Him a crown, but by offering up to Him Christ, who was sacrificed for our sins, that so He that is so merciful and good, may become gracious to them as well as to us."

We have now put before you the doctrine of Purgatory, we have explained it as far we can. Texts of Scripture from your own Bible are quoted from which the doctrine is proved.

The Fathers who certainly represented the doctrine

of the first ages of the Christian Church, are quoted, and all tend to show the reasonableness and necessity of a middle state. We do not strive to explain away anything, we quote even from your own Bible, it is therefore your duty to reflect upon these proofs, and especially the scriptural proofs: do not ignore them, because, they are based upon the Word of God.

CHAPTER XXVII.

Devotion to the Blessed Virgin.

We saw in the preceding chapters that it is lawful to honour the Saints, and that being so no one can reasonably deny honour to the Blessed Virgin; there is a much stronger reason for it, because of the great favour conferred upon her by Almighty God. She is pronounced 'blessed' in the Bible. "The Angel Gabriel was sent from God into a city of Galilee named Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David, and the Virgin's name was Mary. And the Angel came in unto her and said. Hail thou that are highly favoured; the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women. And when she saw him she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. And the Angel said unto her, fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God. And behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son and thou shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the son of the highest, and the Lord shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Then said Mary unto the angel. How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?

And the angel answered and said unto her. The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. . . . And Mary said behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it done unto me according to thy word. And the Angel departed from her. . . . And Mary said: My soul doth magnify the Lord: And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. Because he hath regarded the humility of his handmaid: for behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed" (St. Luke i. 26-48—Protestant Version).

Here she is pronounced blessed twice, and is called the mother of God. In the eleventh Chapter of St. Luke she is again called blessed. "And it came to pass that as He spoke these things a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto Him blessed is the womb that bore Thee and the paps that gave Thee suck" (St. Luke xi. 27—Protestant Version).

It is strange that although Mary is called blessed a number of times in the Scripture that Protestants refuse her this title and only call her the Virgin, as if it were a crime to call her blessed. It is difficult to know what devotion Protestants have to the Mother of God. In the past she was made a special object of their attacks against Catholics, but of late years fair minded Protestants are acknowledging her true position in the great mystery of the Incarnation. At present the question between Catholics and Protestants is not so much the lawfulness of honouring her, but the amount of honour which may be given to her. Here, as in many other cases, there is a great amount of misunderstanding. Protestants do not know the Catholic doctrine, and as a result they condemn us for holding doctrines which we ourselves would reject and condemn.

Nothing is so common as for Protestants to say that we put the Blessed Virgin before Christ; having statues of her and praying to her; instead of praying to Christ. Protestants may rest assured that we do not put the Blessed Virgin before our Redeemer whom we acknow-

ledge to be the One and only Mediator of Redemption between God and Man. That such is the case is clear from the following passage from a work written by Catholics:

"Cursed is every goddess worshipper, who believes the Virgin Mary to be any more than a creature, who worships her or puts his trust in her more than God; who believes her above her Son, or that she can in any way command Him" (*The Papist Misrepresented*).

We honour the Blessed Virgin on account of the favours and graces which God has conferred upon her. She was more highly favoured by God than any other saint and as we honour saints in proportion to the graces which God has conferred upon them we ought to honour the Blessed Virgin more than any other saint, because she was endowed by God with graces greater than those of any other saint. She was the Mother of God, and took a great part in the stupendous mystery of the Incarnation. To honour and invoke the Mother of Jesus Christ is to honour Christ Himself. He is the One Mediator of Redemption between God and Man, she is only a mediator of intercession, just as one of us would be a mediator of intercession with God if we prayed to Him in behalf of our friends.

Now, dear reader, that you see and realize the true position of the Blessed Virgin in the economy of God's dealings with man we will put before you a few extracts from the writings of the early Fathers of the Church. They are both an explanation of, and an apology for the amount of devotion which Catholics have for Our Blessed Lady.

St. Epiphaneus writes thus:—"Though therefore she was a chosen vessel, and endowed with eminent sanctity, still she is a woman, partaking of our common nature but deserving of the highest honours shown to the saints of God. She stands before them all, on account of the heavenly mystery accomplished in her. But we adore no saint, and as this worship is not given to angels, much less can it be allowed to the daughter of Ann. Let Mary then be honoured; but the Father,

Son, and Holy Ghost, one be adored. Let no one adore Mary."

St. Ephrem says :—"After the Trinity thou art mistress of all ; after the Paraclete another Paraclete ; after the Mediator, mediatrix of the whole world."

In another place the same St. Ephrem says :—"We fly to thy patronage Holy mother of God ; protect and guard us under the wings of thy mercy and kindness. Most merciful God through the intercession of the most Blessed Virgin, and of all the angels, and of all the saints, show pity to thy creature. In thee patroness and mediatrix with God, who was born from thee, the human race, O Mother of God, placeth its joy, and ever is dependent upon thy patronage, and in thee alone hath refuge and defence who hast full confidence in Him.

" Behold I also draw nigh to thee, with a fervent soul not having courage to approach thy Son, but imploring that, through thy intercession, I may obtain salvation. Despise not, then, thy servant who placeth all his hopes in thee, after God ; reject him not, placed in grievous danger, and oppressed in many griefs ; but thou who art compassionate, and mother of a merciful God, have mercy upon thy servant." We introduce this passage from St. Ephrem not so much as a plain explanation of the Catholic Doctrine about the Blessed Virgin as an apology for any seemingly strong expressions which are to be found in works of devotion. These expressions are used in a limited sense and their meaning is perfectly well understood by Catholics. There is such a thing as the language of hyperbole but Protestants cannot understand it when applied to the Blessed Virgin. If a lover wrote to his sweetheart and said : 'my adorable queen I worship thee, thou art dearer to me than all else,' would anyone in his senses say that he worshipped her as God.

St. Ambrose says :—" Let the life of the Blessed Mary be ever present to you, in which as in a mirror, the beauty of chastity, and the form of virtue shine forth. She was a virgin not only in body, but in mind, who never sullied the pure affection of her heart by unworthy feelings."

The reason why Protestants do not realize the true position of the Blessed Virgin is because they have wrong notions about our Divine Lord. To sum up then, all that we have said thus far about the Blessed Virgin. We honour her above all the other saints, because she is the Mother of God but we do not give her supreme or divine honour which belongs to God alone; we do not put her before Christ, we do not make her a Mediator like our Redeemer, she is simply a mediator of intercession on the same principle as the other saints of God; or as we ourselves when we pray for each other. Catholics do not err in the amount of devotion they give to the Blessed Virgin, all the honour they give her is borne out by the Bible, She is called blessed in a number of places in the Scripture. She is called a virgin, and her Immaculate Conception is also clear from the Bible.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

The Immaculate Conception of the B. Virgin.

By the Immaculate Conception we mean that the Blessed Virgin Mary was from the very first moment of her conception by special Divine privilege preserved free from every stain of original sin through the merits of Christ. It was defined as an article of faith by Pius IX. in the year 1854. It was always a revealed truth; its being defined to be explicitly believed did not create a new doctrine. The Divinity of Christ and many other revealed truths were believed in the church from the very beginning but were afterwards defined because some heretics denied them.

The definition of the Immaculate Conception is as follows:—"By the authority of Our Lord Jesus Christ,

of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own authority, we declare, pronounce and define, that the doctrine which holds that the most Blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instant of her conception, by a special grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of the Saviour of mankind, was preserved free from all stain of original sin has been revealed by God, and therefore is to be firmly and steadfastly believed by all the faithful. Wherefore if any shall presume, which may God avert, to think in their heart otherwise than has been defined by us, let him know and moreover understand, that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have made shipwreck as regards the faith, and have fallen away from the unity of the Church."

That Mary was Immaculate was always the general feeling of the faithful. The feast of the Immaculate Conception was celebrated in the East as early as the fifth century. The Immaculate Conception refers to the soul of the Blessed Virgin, and to her passive conception, a human body in itself is not capable of contracting the guilt of sin. Sin causes a moral stain. The very moment that the soul of the Blessed Virgin was created and infused into her body she was preserved free from every stain of original sin. At that moment God filled her soul with sanctifying grace, and sanctifying grace and mortal sin cannot co-exist in the same soul.

Mary was by divine privilege preserved from original sin; were it not for this privilege she would have been subject to it like all the other children of Adam; she was preserved in view of the merits of her divine Son; who was her Redeemer as He is ours. Her preservation was a true Redemption, just as one truly redeems his friend if by paying a debt for him he keeps him out of prison quite as really as if he let him go to prison and then paid the debt for him.

It was becoming that the mother of our Divine Lord should be immaculate from the first moment of her existence. If you consider the close relation which existed between her and our Divine Lord you will see at once

how it was right that it should be so. She was to be the Mother of God; can we suppose then that He allowed her soul to be stained by sin for even one moment? for if she were in sin she was at enmity with God, and under the dominion of Satan. We cannot suppose that God ever permitted this. No doubt she was subject to original sin, but God preserved her from it by a special privilege on account of the sacred relations which were to exist between her and her Divine Son.

As Protestants ought to like proofs from Scripture we give the following as a proof for the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed." The meaning of this text according to all the Fathers and ancient interpreters, and the proof drawn from it would be as follows. The serpent is Satan, the woman is Mary the mother of our Redeemer and the seed of the woman is Jesus Christ. In this text there is said to be the same identity of enmity between the woman and the serpent as between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent. But the enmity that exists between Christ (the seed of the woman) and the seed of the serpent is *absolute*. Therefore so too is the enmity between Mary and the devil; but if she were in sin for any length of time this could not be so. Christ and Mary are joined in the same enmity against the devil, but if she were subject to the poison of sin this would not be so on her part.

We shall give the same argument in other words. The enmity which exists between Christ and the devil is *perpetual* and excludes sin of every kind. But in this passage of Sacred Scripture the same enmity is declared to exist between the woman (the Blessed Virgin) and the serpent (that is Satan). Therefore it follows that there must be a *perpetual* enmity between the Blessed Virgin and the devil, and this could not be if she were subject to sin of any kind.

The Council of Basle held in 1429 declared that the Blessed Virgin Mary had never been subject to original sin.

The Council of Trent in passing a decree about original sin said that they did not wish to say anything as to the Blessed Virgin.

In the liturgy of St. Basil she is addressed as "Most holy, most glorious, immaculate lady."

The Fathers of the early Church are very clear in their belief as to the Immaculate Conception of our Blessed Lady.

St. Ephrem a Father of the fourth century says that Mary was "entirely free from every defilement and stain of sin."

St. Cyprian writes:—"Because (Mary) being very different from the rest of mankind, human nature, but not sin, communicated itself to her."

St. Cyril of Alexandria who lived in the beginning of the fifth century writes:—"With the exception of Christ and his Blessed Mother we are all born in sin."

St. Maximus writes:—"Mary clearly was a worthy dwelling place for Christ, not on account of the beauty of her person, but because of original grace."

The following words are to be found in the Greek Liturgy. "It is truly meet that we should praise thee, O Mother of God, who art always to be blessed, and who art exempt from every fault: thou art the Mother of our God, to be venerated in preference to the Cherubim; thou art beyond comparison more glorious than the Seraphim."

We have now shown that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is in accordance with reason, because it was becoming that the stain of sin should never touch the soul of her who was to be the Mother of the Redeemer, who was the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity.

We have proved the doctrine from Sacred Scripture, and we have given passages from some of the great saints and doctors of the early Church which show that they believed and taught that Mary was Immaculate.

We shall now say a few words on two other dogmatic points in connection with the Blessed Virgin, viz., her perpetual Virginity and that she can be called the Mother of God.

The Perpetual Virginity of the Blessed Virgin.

Mary was always a virgin, both before and after the birth of our divine Lord. "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign, behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel" (Isaiah vii. 14.—Protestant Version).

In the Liturgy of St. James she is called "Our most holy, immaculate, and most glorious lady, Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary.

Theodorus Patriarch of Jerusalem said in the second council of Nicea that "Mary is truly the Mother of God, and Virgin before and after childbirth, she was created in the condition more sublime andglorious than that of all natures, whether intellectual or corporeal."

Her perpetual Virginity is also clear from the most ancient symbols of faith especially the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. It was also the constant belief of the Church both in the East and West.

Can Mary be called Mother of God?

In the Second Chapter of St. Luke Mary calls our Divine Lord her Son, now He was God, and if He can be called her Son, She can be called His Mother. "And His Mother said unto Him Son why hast Thou thus dealt with us" (St. Luke 11. 48.—Protestant Version).

In the first Chapter of St. Luke it is said—"And the angel answered and said unto her, the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (St. Luke 1. 35.—Protestant Version).

The Blessed Virgin was not the mother of the divinity. God the Son as to His divine nature was from eternity. She was the Mother of the Person Jesus Christ, and therefore Mother of God. Human mothers do not give birth to the souls of their children and yet no one ever thinks of calling them the mothers only of the bodies of their children.

Nestorius was condemned as early as the year 431 at the Council of Ephesus for the denying that the Blessed Virgin can be called the Mother of God. The Blessed Virgin is the Mother of God the Son as to His human nature which He assumed in her chaste womb, and united it (the human nature) to the divine nature.

St. Anselm explains the necessity for there being two natures in the Redeemer by saying that it was man who offended and who ought therefore to make reparation, but God alone could repair the offence it being infinite, therefore it was becoming that the nature of God and man should be united in the Redeemer. (Cur Deus Homo).

Christ had the divine nature from eternity, He had the human nature only from the time of His Conception or Incarnation.

CHAPTER XXIX.

Penance.

We shall treat this subject rather briefly, because we are convinced that the arguments will have greater force than if they were drawn out at great length. Where there are too many words the point is often obscured.

Penance is a Sacrament instituted by Christ by which the sins whether mortal or venial which are committed after Baptism are forgiven. In the Sacrament of Penance there are four parts, viz., Contrition, Confession, Absolution, and Satisfaction.

(1) Contrition is a sorrow and detestation, for past sins accompanied with a firm resolution to avoid sin in the future.

(2) Confession is a humble declaration of all our sins to a priest. The priest in this Sacrament is only the

minister of God, and acts by virtue of powers delegated to him by Christ.

(3) Absolution is the judicial sentence of pardon pronounced by the priest absolving the penitent from his sins in the name of the Blessed Trinity.

(4) Satisfaction is the doing of some works of penance in order to repair the injury done to God by sin, and to satisfy for the temporal punishment due to it.

No reasonable person can say that there is anything wrong in being sorry for past sins, because sin is a bad thing; nor in resolving to avoid sin in the future. Neither can there be anything wrong in making satisfaction to God for our sins, so that we may repair as far as is within our power the injury done Him by sin. The great objection on the part of non-Catholics is against Confession. Catholics hold that they have no choice in this matter, that confession of sin was instituted by Christ as the one and only means for obtaining pardon of our sins, and that therefore we must have recourse to it. No person who commits sin can ordinarily obtain pardon in any other way. If the Pope fell into sin he is bound to go to confession, if a Bishop or a priest or a very rich man should fall into sin they are bound to confess their sins; just as the humblest poor man in the Church. They have no other means of pardon. We shall now show that Confession is a doctrine of Divine institution.

From the very beginning there was confession of some kind. Adam admitted his guilt before God. So did Cain. And we are told that the Jews came to St. John the Baptist, "Confessing their sins" (St. Matt. iii. 6). The Samaritan woman whom our Lord met at Jacob's well admitted her guilt. Christ in the gentlest possible manner drew a confession from her, and made her acknowledge her sins. We have also in the Book of Josue (vii. 19, 20): "My son give glory to the Lord God of Israel, and confess, and tell me what thou hast done: hide it not. And Achan answered Josue, and said to him: Indeed I have sinned against the Lord God of Israel, and thus have I done." This is an important point but we must proceed to give our direct proofs from the New Testament.

"Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven" (St. Matt. xviii. 18). In this passage Christ promises His apostles the most ample powers, and He fulfilled His promise after His resurrection when He said to them, "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you. When he had said this He breathed on them and He said to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven: and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained" (St. John xx. 22. 23). In these words Christ gave power to the Apostles to forgive sin. Now it would be no good for Him to give them that power if the people were not bound to go and to confess their sins, if the sinner was not bound to go to confession, He would have conferred a useless power upon the Apostles, but Christ does not do a useless work, therefore the people are bound to go and to confess their sins.

St. James (chap. v. 16) tells us: "Confess therefore your sins one to another." This certainly does not mean that we are to confess our sins to the first person we should meet in the streets, and it can by no means refer to confessing them to God because it says expressly confess "one to another." It must then mean that we are to confess our sins to those who by their office are appointed by Almighty God for this purpose, that we are to confess to those who have received from God the power to forgive our sins; to those who are set apart and specially delegated by Christ for this work. Every man has not the power to hold a court and to condemn or acquit men accused of violating the laws of this country. The judges are specially delegated by the Queen for this office, and they, and they alone, have the power to hear cases.

In the Acts of the Apostles it is said: "And many of them that believed came confessing and declaring their deeds" (Acts xix. 18).

Tradition is equally strong on this subject St. Cyprian exhorts all sinners to a timely repentance and to make

an humble confession of their sins, and he says in addition that when absolution is given at random it is dangerous to the givers and useless to the receivers.

St. Basil says:—"In the confession of sins the same method should be observed as in laying open the infirmities of the body. Our sins must be confessed to those to whom has been committed the dispensation of the mysteries of God."

St. Ambrose says:—"The poison is sin, the remedy, the accusation of one's crime, the poison is iniquity, confession is the remedy against relapse."

St. Augustine writes:—"Our merciful God wills us to confess in this world that we may not be confounded in the other . . . . let no one say to himself I do penance to God in private, I do it before God. It is then in vain that Christ hath said, Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. It is vain that the keys have been given to the Church. Do we make void the gospel? Void the words of Christ?"

St Augustine says again:—"If thou wilt have heaven opened to thee, open thy mouth in confession to the priest."

St. Ambrose says:—"If thou wilt be justified confess thy crime, for an humble confession loosens the bonds of sins."

St. Irenaeus writes:—"Some, touched in conscience, publicly confessed their sins; while others in despair, renounced their faith."

Origen says:—"There is yet a more severe and arduous pardon of sins by penance, when the sinner washes his couch with tears, and when he blushes not to disclose his sins to a priest of the Lord. Thus is fulfilled what the Apostle says; Is any man sick among you, let him bring in the priests of the Church (St. James v. 14)."

Origen says again:—"They who are not holy die in their sins; the holy do penance; they feel their wounds; are sensible of their failings; look for the priest; implore health; and through him seek to be purified."

St. Gregory of Nyssa, thus writes:—"Impart your

troubles to the priest as to your father, he will be touched with a sense of your misery. Show to him what is concealed without blushing ; open the secrets of your soul, as if you were showing to a physician a hidden disorder; he will take care of your honour and of your cure."

St. Jerome says :—In like manner with us, the Bishop or priest binds or looses, not them who are merely innocent or guilty ; but having heard, as his duty requires, the various qualities of sins, he understands who should be bound and who loosed."

Pope Leo writes :—" Having lately understood, that some of you, by an unlawful usurpation, having adopted a practice which Tradition does not allow, I am determined by all means to suppress it. I speak of penance, when applied for by the faithful. There shall be no declaration of all kinds of sins, given in writing, and publicly read : for it is enough, that the guilt of conscience be made known to the priest alone by a private confession. That confidence may indeed be thought worthy of praise, which on account of the fear of God, hesitates not to blush before men ; but there are sins, the public disclosure of which must excite fear ; therefore let this improper practice be put an end to, lest many be kept from the remedies of penance, being ashamed or dreading to make known to their enemies such actions as may expose them to legal punishment. That confession suffices, which is first made to God, and then to the priest, who will offer up prayers for the sins of penitents."

Even modern writers who are not Catholics and have no partiality for the Catholic Church admit the wisdom of confession.

M. Francisque Sarcey a leading Freethinker of France speaks thus of confession, " What a pity that our society should be so organized that an action which leaves a a stain upon honour cannot be repaired, forgotten, pardoned. Oh how marvellously inspired was the Catholic religion when it instituted the Sacrament of Penance and the absolution that follows as a consequence. I wish we had in our code, or rather in our

customs, an institution that could be compared to the Sacrament of Penance. Lay society is less powerful than the Catholic priest,"

The Rev Canon Humble, a Protestant clergyman, in "The Church and World," 1866, says:—"The high morality of Ireland is owing, in great part, to the habit of the people (Catholics) going to confession, and the low tone of morals in Scotland is, I fear, greatly to be attributed to the impossibility of having recourse to this sacramental ordinance."

Dr. Forbes, a Protestant, and one of Her Majesty's physicians, in his "Memorandums made on Ireland," says:—"The result of many inquiries is that whether right or wrong in a theological or rational view, this instrument of confession is, among the Irish of the humbler classes, a direct preservative against certain forms of immorality, at least . . . Among other charges preferred against the confessional in Ireland and elsewhere is the facility it affords for corrupting the female mind, and of its actually leading to such corruption. So far from such corruption resulting from the confessional, it is the general belief in Ireland, a belief expressed to me by many trustworthy men in all parts of the country, both by Protestants as well as Catholics, that the singular purity of female life among the lower classes there is, in a considerable degree, owing to this very circumstance. With a view to testing, as far as was practicable, the truth of the theory respecting the influence of confession on this branch of morals, I have obtained, through the courtesy of the Poor Law Commissioners, a return of the number of legitimate and illegitimate children in the workhouses of each of the four provinces of Ireland on a particular day. It is curious to remark how strikingly the results there conveyed correspond with the confession theory; the proportion of the illegitimate children coinciding almost exactly with the proportion of the two religions in each province; being large where the Protestant element is large and small where it is small."

Another writer, Mr. Wm. Gilbert, in an article in the "Christian World," 1864, states that: "While under the guidance of their priests, Irish women as a class enjoy, and with justice, a reputation for respectability of conduct, unsurpassed, if equalled, by any women in the world."

Confession is good for the sinner himself because sin produces sorrow and remorse of conscience and to communicate this sorrow is a relief to the mind, as we often see people who are afflicted with great troubles running to their friends and communicating their sorrows.

Confession is good for society, because when people go to confession they are bound to make restitution if they have defrauded their neighbours.

We have even from civil history a notable example of the necessity of confession. When the city of Frankfort in Germany embraced the doctrines of the so-called Reformation, and rejected the doctrine of confession, the people became so corrupt that the magistrates of that city had to petition the Emperor Charles V. praying him to re-establish confession as the only effectual check upon the passions of the people.

If confession was not instituted by our Divine Lord when was it introduced? It exists in the Catholic Church at the present day. It existed in the sixteenth century for the Council of Trent speaks of it as "an established and venerable institution." It existed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries for the fourth Lateran Council passed a decree concerning it. It existed in the ninth century for the Greek Church which then separated from us still retains confession. So also it existed in the fourth and fifth centuries for the Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, &c., who broke away from the unity of the Church in these early times retain to this day the practice of confession. Therefore confession must have existed in Apostolic times and must be of divine institution.

One plausible objection against confession to a priest is that we can confess to God, alone, by ourselves and that this is sufficient. Our answer to this objection is,

that there is undoubted necessity for confession. Christ has instituted confession as the one and only means for obtaining pardon for our sins, and we must do what Christ has commanded us rather than what would please ourselves. Call to mind the above words of St. Augustine: "Let no one say to himself I do penance to God in private," &c.

God no doubt could have selected many other means whereby we might get pardon of our sins, but since He has not done so it our duty to have recourse to the means which He has put at our disposal.

But we could answer the objection by putting another. When God determined to deliver the children of Israel from the bondage of Eygpt, why did he appoint Moses to deliver them and to lead them into the promised land? He could have done it all Himself. Why did He not interfere directly and destroy Pharaoh and his host? No one denies that He could have done so, and yet He employed Moses as His instrument. God could have divided the waters of the Red Sea yet He employed Moses for this work also.

When the people were dying from thirst in the desert, did God come visibly to their rescue? No—Moses struck the rock and water issued forth by which they were refreshed. When St. Paul was struck down blind as he was on his way to Damascus, and made a vessel of election for the conversion of the Gentiles, did God come down to baptize him, to instruct him, to restore his sight? No, but God told Paul to go to His servant Ananias and that he would do all these things for him. It has ever been the practice of Almighty God to employ human agents, as instruments to execute His merciful designs.

CHAPTER XXX

The Eucharist.

In treating of the Blessed Eucharist we shall adopt the same method as we adopted with confession in the last chapter. We shall put before our readers the passages of scripture bearing on the subject, and then we shall give passages from the Fathers of the Church we shall not comment on them, but shall ask the reader to look at them and to see how clearly the doctrine of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation shines forth in them. These are the two great difficulties of Protestants with regard to the Eucharist. Just a word before we come to the proofs from Scripture and Tradition. If a person who was earnestly seeking for the truth were to ask me for a proof for the Real Presence, and Transubstantiation I would first prove to him that Christ established one and only one true Church upon the earth, I would prove to him that the Catholic Church is this one Church of Christ. Then I would prove that the Catholic Church is infallible in its teaching, and that since the doctrine of the Eucharist is a part of the infallible teaching of the Church of God that it must be infallibly true. We have proved all this. See the chapter on the infallibility of the Church.

"I am the bread of life, your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven that if any man eat of it, he may not die. I am the living bread, which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: how can this man give us his flesh to eat.

"Then Jesus said to them: Amen, Amen, I say unto you: except you eat the flesh of the Son of man,

and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up in the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him as the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me. This is the bread that came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead. He that eateth this bread shall live for ever" (St John VI. 48-59).

Here our Divine Lord promised to give the people bread from heaven, a bread that was to be superior to the manna, a bread that was to be the life of their souls,—his own flesh and blood. The words are plain.

"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread. And giving thanks broke, and said. Take ye and eat: this is my body which shall be delivered for you: this do for the commemoration of me.

"In like manner also the chalice, after he had supped, saying: this chalice is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me. For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord, until he come. Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the chalice. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord" (1 Cor. xi. 23-29).

Now St. Paul could never speak after this manner if Christ was not truly present in the Eucharist, or if it were only what Protestants say it is.

"And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed and broke: and gave to his disciples, and said: take ye, and eat: this is my body.

"And taking the chalice he gave thanks: and gave to them, saying; Drink ye all of this. For this is my blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins (St. Matt. xxvi 26-28).

Here our Divine Lord tells them expressly that He is giving them His body to eat and His blood to drink. If Transubstantiation had not taken place he could not say of the bread "this is my body" of the wine "this is my blood." Theologians illustrate this by an example. They say that no person could hold up an apple in which was concealed a piece of gold and say "this is gold." Such a mode of speaking is not recognized among men.

The early Fathers speak clearly on the doctrine of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem writes:—"This doctrine of the Blessed Paul may be sufficient to satisfy you concerning the divine mysteries which you have received, that you have been made partakers of the body and blood of Christ; for he now says, that the Lord Jesus Christ, in the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread and gave it to his disciples, saying, 'take, eat; This is my body.' And taking the chalice, and giving thanks, said, 'Take, drink this is my blood.' Since Christ himself then did so affirm and say of the bread, 'this is my body' who shall henceforth presume to make any doubt of it? And since he affirms and says, 'this is my blood' who I say, shall doubt, and say it is not His blood?

"He once changed water into wine (which has some likeness to blood) in Cana of Galilee, by His own power: and shall He not be thought worthy of belief in changing wine into blood? Being invited to an earthly marriage He wrought this stupendous miracle, and shall we not much rather confess, that He gave His own body and blood to the children of the bridegroom? Therefore, with full assurance let us receive the body and blood of Christ. For under the type (or appearance) of bread the body is given unto thee, and under the type of wine the blood; that receiving the body and blood of Christ, thou mayest be co-partner with him of His body and blood; so shall we be Christophori, carriers of Christ,

when we receive His body and blood into our members; and by this means (as St. Peter saith) be made partakers of the Divine nature. Do not consider them as naked bread, and naked wine, for it is the body and blood of Christ according to the words of our Lord Himself. For when you take them, you are not commanded to take bread and wine, but under the appearance of these to take the body and blood of Christ."

St. Chrysostom writes thus:—"That terrible and stupendous cup—that which is in the cup is that which flowed from His side, and we partake of it. It is not of the altar, but of Christ Himself we partake; let us therefore approach to Him with all reverence and purity; and when thou beholdest the body lying before thee, say to thyself, by this body I am no longer earth and ashes. This is that very body which bled—which was pierced by the lance.

"He that was present at the last supper, is the same who is now present, and consecrates our feast: for it is not man who makes the things lying on the altar become the body and blood of Christ, but that Christ who was crucified for us. The words are pronounced by the priest, but it is the power and grace of God that consecrates them. He said, 'this is my body,' these words make the change.

"As many as partake of this body, as many as taste of this blood, think it nothing different from that which sits above, and is adored by angels."

"The table supplies the place of the manger; for even here shall lie the body of our Lord, not wrapped in swaddling clothes, as then, but surrounded on all sides by the Holy Spirit. They that are initiated understand these things. The Magi, or wise men, did nothing but adore; but thou if thou comest with a pure conscience, wilt be permitted to take Him to thyself.

"Call to mind with what honour thou art dignified of what table thou partakest. For we are fed with that thing which, when the angels behold they tremble. Neither can they without fear see, by reason of the glory which cometh from thence; and we are reduced

into one mass with him. Christ's body being one and and His flesh one; who shall declare the power of the Lord—who shall make known his praises? What shepherd ever fed his sheep with his own members?"

St. Augustine writes:—"There was, you are all aware, first the sacrifice of the Jews, which consisted in victims of cattle, and that is a mystery. The sacrifice of the Body and Blood of our Lord which the faithful know who read the gospel, but which all do not know, and which it were to be wished some did not know to their condemnation, was not then instituted, which sacrifice is now established all over the world." St. Augustine in his work called 'the City of God' records the following remarkable event.

"A certain man called Hesperius of the Tribunitial Order, who still liveth convenient to us, hath a little farm called Zubedi in the territories of Fusali, which he having believed, by the injury done his servants and cattle, to be haunted with evil spirits, besought my priests in my absence that one of them should go thither, and expel them by prayers; one accordingly went, offered there the sacrifice of Christ's body, praying with all his might that this evil might cease, and by the mercy of God it did cease."

We shall quote two other passages from St. Augustine. "We receive with a faithful heart and mouth the Mediator of God and man—the man Jesus Christ, who has given us His body to eat, and His blood to drink."

Writing about the Jews who were converted by St. Peter he says:—"They were converted, they were baptized, they approached the table of the Lord, and now believing, they drank that blood which in their rage they had shed." All these passages are from three early Fathers and Doctors who were the great lights of the Church. We leave their words to speak for themselves. In the next chapter we shall treat of the Eucharist as a sacrifice.

CHAPTER XXXI.

The Sacrifice of the Mass.

The Eucharist is not only a sacrament, it is also a sacrifice. A sacrifice is the oblation of a sensible thing made to God through a lawful minister by a real change in the thing offered, to testify to God's absolute authority over us, and our entire dependence on Him. Sacrifice is the one act of worship which is reserved for God alone, it is an act by which we acknowledge the supreme dominion of God over all things.

From the very beginning of the world there was sacrifice offered up to God. Abel offered to God sacrifice from his flocks, and Cain offered of the fruits of the earth.

After the deluge the first act of Noe was to offer sacrifice to God in thanksgiving; and God Himself commanded Abraham to offer up sacrifice.

God approved of and accepted the worship which was given to Him by sacrifice, and when the written Law was given to the people the mode of offering up the different sacrifices was regulated by divine authority. But the sacrifices of the Old Law were only for a time, and were to typify the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, from which they derived whatever efficacy they had. When our Divine Saviour offered Himself as a sacrifice for our redemption all these sacrifices of the Old Law ceased to have any efficacy.

The Old Testament in many places foretells the one great sacrifice of the New Law. Christ is spoken of as a "priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech." Melchisedech who was a high priest, offered to God a sacrifice of bread and wine, therefore as Christ was to be a priest according to the order of Melchisedech He was to offer up for ever a sacrifice under the appear-

ance of bread and wine. This is what takes place in the Mass where bread and wine are consecrated, and become the body and blood of Christ; and are offered up to God as a perpetual memorial of His passion and death on the cross.

The prophet Malachy speaks in the plainest terms of the great sacrifice of the New Law. "For from the rising of the sun, even to the going down, My name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My name a clean oblation; for My name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts" (Mal. i. 10-11).

It would be well to call to mind here what has been said in the last chapter on the Eucharist. Keeping all this before our minds it will not be difficult for us to show that the Mass is a real Sacrifice.

The Mass is the sacrifice of the body and blood of Jesus Christ really present on the altar under the appearance of bread and wine, and offered to God for the living and the dead. Here we have all the conditions required for a sacrifice. We have the victim who is Jesus Christ, we have an offering made to God of His body and blood, and we have the high priest Jesus Christ who is the principal offerer, the priest who officiates being only His minister.

Any one believing in the Eucharist ought not to experience any difficulty in the doctrine of the Mass; because it is clear that such a great and stupendous act as the consecration of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ must be attended by solemn prayer and ceremony.

The Mass is one and the same sacrifice with that of the Cross. The two are essentially the same. Jesus Christ is the High Priest in both. He is the principal offerer, the priest who says the Mass takes His place and acts in His name, and in His authority, and in His person. They differ only in the manner of offering.

Christ on the Cross offered Himself up in a bloody manner, shedding His blood and actually dying. In the Mass He offers Himself up in an unbloody manner, and

dies mystically, His death being represented by the separate consecration of bread and wine. Christ by His passion and death purchased graces and blessings for man, the Mass which is a representation and commemoration of the Passion and death of our Divine Saviour is the application of these merits to our souls.

The sacrifice of the Mass does not take away from the sacrifice of the Cross, nor is it independent of it, since it is the application to our souls of the blessings and graces which Jesus Christ purchased for us by dying on the Cross.

We shall now prove from Scripture and Tradition that the Mass is a sacrifice instituted by Christ.

First argument: "And I will not receive a gift of your hand; for, from the rising of the sun even to the going down, My name is great among the Gentiles: and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My name a clean offering; for My name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts" (Malachy i. 10). From this passage it is clear that the sacrifices of the Old Law were to be rejected, "I will not receive a gift of your hand," and that in their place a pure offering which was to be a new sacrifice was to be instituted and that this great sacrifice of the New Law was to be offered up in all parts of the world from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof. The sacrifice of the Mass alone fulfils this prophecy of Malachy.

Second argument: We deduce a second argument for the sacrifice of the Mass from what took place at the Last Supper. Jesus Christ Himself was the first to offer up the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

At the Last Supper our Divine Saviour consecrated bread into His body. "And taking bread, He gave thanks, and brake; and gave to them, saying: This is My body which is given for you. Do this for a commemoration of Me" (St. Luke xxii. 19). "Take ye and eat: this is My body which shall be delivered for you: this do for the commemoration of Me" (1 Cor xi. 24); and He consecrated wine into His blood: "And taking

the Chalice; He gave thanks: and gave to them, saying: Drink ye all of this. For this is My blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins" (St. Matt. xxvi. 28). "And He said to them: This is My blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many" (St. Mark xiv. 24).

From these passages it is clear that our Divine Saviour at the last supper offered up His own body and blood for the remission of sins and commanded His disciples to do the same, "do this in commemoration of Me." The way it is expressed by St. Paul emphasises the fact that the disciples were to continue to offer up the sacrifice which their divine Master had instituted. "For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord, until He come" (1 Cor xi. 26).

At the time that He did this, He had not died actually, nor was there as yet a real effusion of His blood, because the events of the Passion had not yet commenced, nevertheless He offered up in sacrifice His body and blood for the remission of sins. His death being represented in a mystical manner by the separate consecration of the bread and wine. Now this is what takes place in the sacrifice of the Mass. Everything which takes place at Mass was done by our Divine Saviour at the Last Supper. There was the separate consecration of bread and wine into His body and blood. There was the High Priest offering up a pure oblation for the remission of sins. There was no actual death or shedding of blood, all this being represented in a mystical manner.

We can deduce a third and a very strong argument from expressions that are used by St. Paul such as altar, table of the Lord, sacrifice, oblation, priest, &c. Now these terms as they are used by St. Paul would be unintelligible if there was not some sacrifice in the New Law. "We have an altar whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle" (Hebrews xiii. 10). See also 1 Cor. x. Priest and sacrifice, altar and sacrifice, are terms one of which implies the other.

Tradition is so strong on the sacrifice of the Mass that we shall give only a few extracts from the early Fathers.

St. Justin who was a disciple of St. John the Evangelist says:—"Christ instituted a sacrifice in bread and wine which Christians offer up in every place."

St. Irenaeus, who was Bishop of Lyons and a disciple of St. John, says:—"Christ in consecrating bread and wine, has instituted the sacrifice of the New Law which the Church received from the Apostles, according to the prophecy of Malachy."

St. Cyprian says:—"Who is more truly a priest of God most high than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered a sacrifice to God the Father and offered the same sacrifice which Melchisedech offered (that is, bread and wine) namely His own body and blood."

St. Cyprian again calls the Eucharist "a true and full sacrifice;" and says, that "as Melchisedech offered bread and wine, so Christ offered the same, namely His body and blood" (See Milner).

St. Augustine says:—"His body is offered up instead of all those sacrifices and oblations, and it is given to the communicants."

These passages are short, clear, and forcible.

The Mass is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. "When a priest celebrates Mass, he honours God, he rejoices the angels, he edifies the Church, he helps the living, he obtains rest for the dead, and makes himself a partaker of all that is good" (Thomas à Kempis).

It is a sacrifice of propitiation. "We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just, and He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world" (1 St. John ii. 1-2).

It is a sacrifice of supplication. "For if the blood of goats and of oxen, and the ashes of a heifer being sprinkled, sanctify such as are defiled to the cleansing of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the Holy Ghost, offered Himself without spot to God, cleanse our conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" (Hebrews ix. 13-14.) "Let us

therefore go, with confidence, to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace in seasonable aid" (Heb. iv. 16).

We shall treat briefly of two common objections against the sacrifice of the Mass.

The first objection is that St. Paul speaks of Christ offering Himself once for the sins of the world. "But this man offering one sacrifice for sin, for ever sitteth at the right hand of God." St. Paul here is speaking of the one bloody sacrifice which Christ offered up on Calvary and is contrasting the efficacy of this one sacrifice over the many sacrifices of the Old Law. He does not say anything against the repetition of the sacrifice of the Mass which is the same in essence as the sacrifice of the Cross ; in fact St. Paul says (1 Cor. xi.) that Christ commanded His Apostles to offer up the sacrifice of the New Law in order "to show the death of the Lord until He come."

Another objection is that the sacrifice of the Cross was infinite and therefore there is no necessity for its repetition. The sacrifice of the Cross was infinite but by its repetition in the Mass we apply its merits to our souls. Why do Protestants pray, or go to church, or baptize their children if the sacrifice of the Cross is all sufficient? Christ purchased many blessings for us but we must apply them to our souls by some channels.

It might be well to state why the Mass is not said in the vernacular. There are many reasons for this. Latin is the language of the Church. Living languages are continually changing their meaning, and this would necessitate frequent changes in the Liturgy. The Mass is said in nine or ten different languages but it is said in no living language for this reason. The same thing takes place among the Jews who have their Liturgy in Hebrew although many of them do not understand that language. Our people have a translation of nearly all the Mass in their prayer books.

CHAPTER XXXII.

The Priesthood.

Holy Orders is a Sacrament by which spiritual power and grace are given to priests in order to enable them to perform their sacred duties.

By this Sacrament the priests of the Church receive power to offer up the sacrifice of the Mass and to forgive sins in the Sacrament of Penance. Priests are the ministers of God, "Let a man so regard us, as ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God" (St. Paul, 1 Cor. iv. 1).

If there was necessity in the Old Law for a priesthood to carry out the ceremonial of the Jews and to offer up the sacrifice of victims, there is much greater necessity for a priesthood in the New Law, in order to administer the sacraments, &c., and to offer up the great and stupendous sacrifice of the Eucharist which Christ has instituted and left to us. "Go ye into the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature" (St. Mark xvi. 15). "Feed my lambs feed my sheep."

Priests take vows of chastity and obedience. Should they violate these vows they become guilty of sin, just as married people are guilty of sin if they are unfaithful to each other,

From the very nature of their office priests ought to be learned and holy. They ought to be learned because they have to instruct the people ; "The lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and they (the people) shall seek the law at his mouth" (Malach ii. 7). "Be sanctified, ye that carry the vessels of the Lord." (Isaias lii. 11).

The Church requires that her priests should not be married; however, this is in great part a matter of discipline, and is an ecclesiastical law which the Church has imposed for very good reasons.

The principal of these reasons are: (1) That her ministers may be able to give themselves entirely to God's work, "He that is unmarried, careth for the things of the Lord, how he may please God. But he who is married is solicitous about the things of the world how he may please his wife, and he is divided" (1 Cor. vii. 32-33). How could a man distracted with the cares of a wife and family undertake to convert pagan nations, or give his time and attention to the work of the Church? In times of disease or pestilence would such a man be inclined to risk his life in ministering to the spiritual wants of those who might be struck down by fever or cholera or small-pox?

(2) Priests on account of the sanctity of their office ought to be holy and a single life is more conducive to sanctity than that of marriage. "There are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He who can take it let him take it" (St. Matt. xix. 12); and St. Paul says:—"He that giveth his virgin in marriage doeth well, but he that giveth her not doeth better, I say to the unmarried, and to widows it is good for them if they so continue, even as I" (1 Cor. vii. 8); and St. Peter said to our divine Lord, "Behold we have left all things and followed Thee."

Even Protestant writers admit that it is a good thing for the clergy to be unmarried.

Lord Bacon writes:—"A single life doth well with Churchmen; for charity will hardly water the ground, where it must first fill a pool."

The fact that Catholic priests lead a single life is in a great measure the secret of their success amongst the pagans, and it is also the cause of the love and the respect which they meet not only from their own people, but also from those who are outside the one true fold of Jesus Christ. It might be well to remark that candidates for the priesthood embrace, of their own free will, a single life. They are as free to do so as other people are to embrace the married life. But having taken the step they are bound to keep their vow of chastity, just as a man who gets married is bound to keep his vows to his

wife. The priests of the Catholic Church have as much right to select their state of life as other people. There are thousands of people in the world who lead single lives.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

Monks and Nuns.

As monks and nuns seem to be special objects of attack for some zealous Protestants, we shall say a few words on the subject. Monks and nuns are persons who take three vows, viz., the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. If we examine these vows we shall find nothing bad or wrong in them. In fact it is quite the other way. They are three virtues that are extolled by our Divine Lord himself. "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (St. Matt. v. 3). "Blessed are the clean of heart; for they shall see God" (St. Matt. v. 7). "Obedience is better than sacrifice." Since then the virtues of poverty, chastity, and obedience are so strongly recommended in Sacred Scripture, and since they were virtues very dear to our Divine Lord and practised by Him, no reasonable person ought to object to Catholics practising them.

Perhaps we could not do better than leave honest Protestants to refute the calumnies which have been brought against monks and nuns.

The Daily Chronicle in its review of a new edition of Montalembert's *Monks of the West* writes thus:—

"Everyone is now aware that the monks of the West, down to at least the twelfth century, did a work which Positivists like M. Comte would describe as social and civilizing. They made Christians of all those races from which we Europeans come down. They built thou-

sands of monasteries, that grew into towns or villages, and were centres of learning and the arts; they improved agriculture, they sheltered the defenceless, they tempered the rigour of feudalism, they founded all manner of humane institutions, and they preserved the Latin, and to some extent the Greek, classics, as well as the Bible—in all which departments they were well read. The legend of their idleness is an exploded fiction. They were at all times indulgent landlords. So much is certain. In these fascinating pages the author gives chapter and verse for every detail, often citing that fine mediæval Latin which is an adornment to his style, and enabling us to see for ourselves what the evidence amounts to on which he has gone in his picturesque delineations."

Captain Crawford, himself a non-Catholic, speaking in reprobation of the calumnies of the A. P. A. in America says:—

"On all God's green and beautiful earth, there are no purer, no nobler, no more kind-hearted and more self-sacrificing women than those who wear the sombre garb of the Catholic Sisters. During the war I had many opportunities for observing them. How many veterans of the war can yet recall the soft, soothing touch of a Sister's hand as he lay on the pain-tossed couch of a hospital? Can we ever forget their sympathetic eye, their low, soft spoken words of encouragement when the result of the struggle between life and death yet hung in the balance? I am not a Catholic but I stand ready at any and all times to defend those noble women, even with my life, for I owe that life to them."

The Editor of the *San Francisco Star*, himself a prominent Protestant, answering the attacks of certain Protestant clergymen of that city on the Sisters of Charity writes as follows:—"Their holy calling will not permit them to resent the base attack made upon their honour, which the human monstrosity who penned it, and 'whom it were basest flattery to term a coward,' well knew. But if they have fathers, brothers, or

friends, they should 'lash the scoundrel naked through the streets.' Look at the faces of the noble women called 'Sisters of Charity,' all aglow with innocence, and peace and love, and picture, if you can, the blackness blacker than hell of the heart of him who, claiming to be an American, a man, or even a human being, could so traduce women who, knowing there is work for willing hands to do, voluntarily give up the joys and pleasures of the world, and become earth's angels by their unselfish devotion to humanity. On the battle-field, tenderly ministering to the wounded; in the midst of pestilence from which even the bravest fly; by the side of a leper, loathsome and shunned by all others, these gentle souls are to be found, and fear not. To be by the bedside of the sick, giving comfort and hope; in the damp basement and cold garret relieving misery and want; to give light to the ignorant and joy to the despairing; to seek places where the merely 'righteous' may not go, and be not ashamed to take the erring ones by the hand and kneel with them in prayer; to visit the condemned wretch in the prison cell, and, by kind words and deeds, inspire him with the love of God, and give him the peace of mind 'which passeth all understanding;' all these things, and many more, are the daily duties of the Sisters of Charity, who worship at the Catholic shrine, but whose creed—to do good—embraces all the world, and is as broad as the universe itself."

The following letter which explains matters in a clear and brief manner was given to me by a Protestant gentleman.

(To the Editor of *The Christian World.*)

Sir— Allow me a few lines in reply to 'Eye-Witness.' He should have signed himself 'Prejudice.' He saw little and heard nothing, but judged a great deal. Is this charity? Is this truth? I will take the one fact, that he saw a pale nun. He says that at length he 'found an opportunity' of entering. This is to insinuate that no one was allowed entrance except by stealth

or force. I know hundreds of Protestants who have been in our convents. Indeed, any one may go in who is a gentleman, on proper introduction.

Convents are not merely subject to the Pope. The bishop can inspect, and the confessor and priest is there every day. They are subject to English law in civil matters. They know what goes on.

Are nuns unhappy? All are not certainly. I know a great numbers of nuns and convents. I remember none at present who wish to leave and could not. But this I can say, that the vast majority of nuns are happy and that the mirth and joy in a convent far surpass anything in the world outside. There is not perfect happiness anywhere in this world. If there is such a thing it is in a convent.

I love nuns, and feel indignant when they are thus slandered by spies and bigots who see nothing but the outside. A pale nun! I suppose no one is pale except in a convent! The nuns themselves laugh at this bigotry, at this falsehood.—I remain yours sincerely,

A PRIEST.

This subject would be incomplete without saying something about escaped nuns, so we give Sarah McCormack's retractation.

"I, Sarah McCormack, who have falsely called myself the White Nun, wish to make this public statement. I was born of Catholic parents, brought up in the Catholic religion, and attended St. Margaret's Catholic School, Airdrie, from the time I was seven years of age until I was fourteen. I worked for one year in Airdrie Weaving Mill, and then took a situation as general servant in Glasgow. It was as servant or as mill hand that I lived until September, 1893. I then met Mr.————. He induced me, for the sake of making money, to lecture against nuns and convents, and he gave me a book called "Maria Monk," telling me to read it and obtain my facts and knowledge of convents from it. I have since learnt that the statements in that book were proved to be

utterly false by the daughter of the authoress. I now wish to state solemnly and publicly that I never was a nun, that I was never in a convent except when I went there for an hour in the evening to receive instruction, and that all my statements about nuns and convents were taken from that book given to me. I now wish humbly and publicly to beg pardon for all the scandal I have given, to implore forgiveness of those I have slandered and to devote my life to penance and reparation for the past."

CHAPTER XXXIV.

Ceremonies.

It is not our intention here to go into detail and to explain the different ceremonies used in the Catholic Church; we shall content ourselves with giving the principal reasons why they are employed in the service of the Church.

Ceremonies are external acts used in the service of God. Reason itself dictates to us the utility of ceremonies. All the great events which take place in the world such as marriages and festive gatherings are attended with a great deal of outward ceremony. If a royal marriage were about to take place the papers for weeks previous to the event would give detailed accounts of the different ceremonies.

Religion of whatever kind cannot go on without some kind of ceremony.

Man is composed of a body and soul, and there is nothing so natural as that he should give expression to the interior devotion of his heart in outward actions. Again, impressions come to the heart through the medium of the senses, and thus by means of earthly things

the mind is raised up to the contemplation of heavenly things.

There was a great number of ceremonies in the Old Law, and their use was commanded by Divine authority.

And in the New Law our Saviour frequently made use of ceremonies; we are told that a poor blind man besought Him to give him back his sight. Our Divine Lord could have done so by a mere word, by even a mere act of His will, but we are told in the Bible that He took clay from the earth and wet it with spittle from His mouth, and with this anointed the eyes of the blind man, and he received back his sight.

Some ceremonies are essential and others are accidental for instance in the Sacrament of Baptism it is essential to have the intention of baptizing, and to pour the water on the head of the child, and while pouring the water to say the words of the form—I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. But there are a number of other ceremonies in connection with Baptism which are only accidental such as putting salt into the mouth, anointing the ears and nostrils with spittle, putting a white cloth on the head, and a candle into the hand of the child. If non-Catholics study the ceremonies they will find that there is not a single ceremony made use of in the Catholic Church which has not its special signification. There is nothing so puzzling as ceremonies when their meaning is not known or understood.

Protestants are often at a loss to know why we have lighted candles during Mass. These lighted candles are a symbol of joy just as are illuminations on occasions of public rejoicing.

The use of incense is another thing which is not very well understood by non-Catholics. Incense is a symbol of prayer and charity. "Let my prayer be directed as incense in thy sight" (Psalm cxl. 2).

And St. John says that he saw four and twenty ancients and the angels offering up to God "golden vials full of odours which are the prayers of the saints (Rev. v. 8). "And another Angel came, and stood before the

altar, having a golden censer; and there was given to him much incense, that he should offer of the prayers of all the Saints upon the golden altar, which is before the throne of God" (Rev. viii. 2).

CHAPTER XXXV.

Religious Persecution.

Persecution is no part of the Catholic faith. The Catholic Church does not adopt and never adopted persecution as a means to advance its interests. She condemns it.

That Catholics and Protestants foolishly fought against each other is only too true. That kings and princes persecuted under the name of religion for their own political purposes is also true. The Catholic Church never approved of this policy. But the blame of all the abuses which have taken place in the past is unfairly put down to the intolerance of the Catholic Church.

We must always remember that error in every sphere of life is a bad thing, but is especially bad in religious matters, because it might endanger the eternal salvation of souls.

The Church although full of charity for everyone has no toleration for error. The Church pities the erring, but she is intolerant of error and must be so from the nature of her mission.

To prove that the Catholic Church is intolerant and advocates persecution it would be necessary to bring forward some article of our faith, or some decree of a General Council, or some pronouncement of a Pope teaching *ex cathedra*, as head of the Church, which declares that it is lawful to persecute. Protestants are

not able to do this. There is no article of our faith, no decree of a General Council, no infallible pronouncement of any Pope to such an effect. Even if a Pope did persecute, nothing could be proved from this unless he taught that such was lawful in his capacity of an infallible teacher speaking *ex cathedra*. If he acted in his own private capacity no point could be made against the teaching of the Church. As an individual he might do wrong.

There might have been abuses at times on the part of misguided Catholics, but you cannot put down such abuses to the Catholic Church. If a Catholic at the present day committed murder would any sensible man argue from that fact that the Catholic Church teaches that murder is lawful? Or if a band of Orangemen made a raid upon their Catholic neighbours and killed them would it be right to say that all Protestants are equally bad?

In the Middle Ages a different state of things existed from the present. There was a union between the Church and State, and an offence against the Church was also an offence against the State. In those days the Church did nothing more than declare who was guilty of heresy. The State had its punishments for heresy because heresy was the source of innumerable evils, and was the cause of revolts in the State as well as in the Church. So much was the spirit of the Church opposed to persecution that it did not allow any one who participated in the death or mutilation of another to become one of its ministers.

If Protestants read the history of their religion they will find it to their advantage to say very little about persecution. It was a Protestant principle that every person could read and interpret the Bible as he wished, still in practice the founders of the Reformation were intolerant from the beginning, and advocated persecution wherever they gained ascendancy.

Rousseau says:—"The Reformation was intolerant from its cradle, and its authors universally persecutors."

Luther persecuted those who disagreed with him and

wrote in defence of persecution. "If we send thieves to the gallows and robbers to the block, why do we not fall on those masters of perdition, the Popes, Cardinals, and Bishops, with all our force, and not give over till we have bathed our hands in their blood."

Again speaking of the Pope he says:—"If you fall before the beast has received its mortal wound, you will have but one thing to be sorry for, that you did not bury your dagger in its breast. All who defend him must be treated like a band of robbers, be they kings or be they Cæsars."

Calvin persecuted those who disagreed with him in a most merciless manner.

John Knox was a most awful persecutor, and was not ashamed to write to the effect that his lawful sovereign should be dethroned and put to death. "The nobility and people were bound in conscience, not only to withstand the proceedings of that Jezabel, Mary, whom they called Queen, but also to put her to death and all her priests with her."

Mackey in his "Curious Superstitions" says that in virtue of the persecution inaugurated by John Knox 17,000 witches were burned in Scotland alone in the course of forty years.

Bishop Usher and eleven other Protestant Bishops presented a petition to Parliament in which they declared that "to give toleration to Papists, is to become accessary to superstition, idolatory, and the perdition of souls; and that, therefore, it is a grievous sin." We shall treat in order of (1) The Spanish Inquisition (2) Queen Mary (3) The Massacre of St. Bartholomew (4) The Smithfield fires (5) Galileo, because these are the great themes with Protestants when they endeavour to convict the Catholic Church of persecution. They never speak about the Penal Laws of Henry VIII., Elizabeth and their successors, by which good Catholic subjects were fined, robbed of their property, hanged, drawn, and quartered for adhering to the faith of their fathers.

The Spanish Inquisition.

The Spanish Inquisition was not instituted by the Church, it was established by Ferdinand and Isabella more from political than from religious motives. It was enforced especially against the Jews and the Moors who were the political enemies of the Spanish throne.

Ranke, a German Protestant historian, writes:—"In the first place the Inquisitors were royal officers. The king had the right of appointing and dismissing them. . . . The Courts of the Inquisition were subject like other magistrates, to royal visitors. "Do you not know," said the king (to Ximines), "that if this tribunal possesses jurisdiction it is from the king it derives it."

Again he writes :—"It was in spirit and tendency a political institution. The Pope had an interest in thwarting it, and he did so; but the king had an interest in constantly upholding it."

When Spain obtained possession of Naples, and endeavoured to establish its Inquisition there, Paul III. said, "No, it is too severe, we shall not have the Inquisition in Italy."

When Spain came into possession of Milan an effort was made to establish the Inquisition there also, Paul IV. said, "No, the sentences are too cruel."

Sixtus IV. issued a Bull against the Inquisitors in which he rebuked their excessive punishment and threatened them with deprivation. He also wrote to Ferdinand and Isabella saying that "mercy towards the guilty was more pleasing to God than the severity which they were using."

The Spanish Inquisition was used against the ecclesiastics of the Catholic Church when it suited some political purpose. The Archbishop of Toledo was cast into prison by the Inquisition for sixteen years and left there until the day of his death.

If Protestants want examples of inhuman cruelty they need not go to Spain for them, their own country furnishes far better examples.

Prescott says that the administration of Elizabeth

"was not a whit less despotic and scarcely less sanguinary than" that of Isabella. (Ferdinand and Isabella Vol. III. p. 202.) In the reign of Elizabeth a fine of £20 per month was inflicted upon those who refused to be present at the Protestant worship. Catholics were thrown into dungeons, hanged, drawn and quartered for the profession and practice of their faith, During the reign of Elizabeth more than a hundred different offences were punished with death. Picking pockets, arson, sheep stealing, &c., were punished with death. The English code of laws after the time of the Reformation was most barbarous; and it continued to be so long after the time that the abuses of the Inquisition were done away with in Spain.

Queen Mary.

We are not going to defend any abuses which took place in the reign of Queen Mary. Queen Mary was not the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church did not sanction the persecutions which took place in her reign. These persecutions are grossly exaggerated by Protestants in order to suit their own purposes. No doubt Mary put Lady Jane Grey to death. But she was an usurper of Mary's throne, and was thereby guilty of high treason; and death was the punishment for this offence. If a person usurped the Crown of England at the present day and endeavoured to dethrone Queen Victoria such a person would in all probability meet with the same fate.

Macaulay contrasting Mary with Elizabeth writes thus:—"Mary. . . did nothing for her religion which she was not prepared to suffer for. She had held it firmly under persecution. She fully believed it to be essential to salvation. Elizabeth, in opinion, was little more than half a Protestant. She had professed when it suited her, to be wholly a Catholic. . . What can be said in defence of a ruler who is at once indifferent and intolerant?"

Hallam writes:—"The rack seldom stood idle in the tower for all the latter part of Elizabeth's reign."

The Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

The Catholic Church had nothing whatsoever to do with the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. Charles IX. urged on by Catherine de Medicis assassinated Admiral Coligny the leader of the Huguenots who were a powerful body and the political opponents of the king. The assassination of Coligny and his followers took place in Paris, August 24th, 1572, and was followed by a general massacre in many of the towns and cities of France. The Catholic Church had nothing to do with all this. Neither Charles nor his mother were very zealous Catholics. He murdered these Huguenots because they were a constant danger to his throne.

After the Massacre the king depatched an envoy to each of the Courts of Europe, telling how the king and the royal family had escaped from a terrible conspiracy. A similiar message was despatched to the Pope, and, the Pope not knowing the truth of what had occurred ordered a "Te Deum" to be sung and a medal to be struck off in thanksgiving for the safe delivery of the king and royal family. It is easy to see how this could have occurred, for communication between places far apart was a question of some days or even months. Needless to say that what the Pope did was not in honour of the massacre which took place, and which he condemned when he heard the true state of affairs.

During the massacre three hundred Calvinists took refuge in the house of the Archbishop of Lyons. The other Catholic Bishops of France acted in a similiar manner. If a message were sent at the present day to the Pope that Queen Victoria and all the other members of the Royal family escaped safely from a band of assassins who wanted to kill them all, he might order a "Te Deum" to be sung in thanksgiving to God for their preservation.

The Smithfield Fires.

We shall leave a Protestant minister of the Church of England to explain all about the Smithfield fires. In

1871 the Protestants were about to consecrate a memorial church built to commemorate these so-called martyrs. The Rev. Thomas Hugo who was at that time the clergyman of the place protested against this; and moreover gave a piece of his mind to Dr. Jackson who was his Bishop. He writes thus to his Lordship:

"It is currently reported that your LORDSHIP will be solicited to consecrate an edifice erected near West Smithfield by the name of the Smithfield Martyrs' Memorial. The Church of England, my LORD, has carefully abstained from any such act of quasi-canonization of those various sufferers, and the omission would seem to be intentional. I have devoted much time and study to the records of our history, and I have been led to the irresistible conclusion that to a very small number of the aforesaid sufferers can the title of martyr be truthfully applied. West Smithfield was the place of execution for the worst and most abandoned criminals. Even in those instances where the religious opinions of the sufferers was the ostensible cause of their punishment the culprits were for the most part atheists Socinians, Munster Anabaptists, and members of other wild sects. Full demonstrative proof of this may be derived from the London and other chronicles. I am able and ready to supply such a list. For all these reasons I consider it my bounden duty to call your LORDSHIP'S attention to the endeavour which is now made, possibly through ignorance, to induce your LORDSHIP to an act which will be denounced as alike opposed to historical truth and Christian morality, and calculated accordingly to bring evil and disgrace upon all who are unhappily connected with it."

GALILEO.

Long before the time of Galileo good Catholics held as a theory that the earth moves, and goes round the sun. It is said that St. Virgilius, an Irish Saint who laboured in Germany and who was honoured by the Pope with a bishopric in that country, was the first to

give proofs to show that this theory was probable. The illustrious Nicholas Cusa a Catholic priest held the theory as probable; and he was honoured by the Pope with a Cardinal's hat.

The immortal Copernicus also advocated the theory that the earth goes round the sun and wrote a book showing its probability which was dedicated to the then Pope, Paul III. These great men were not condemned but honoured by Rome, because they did not drag in religion and Scripture into their scientific investigations.

Why then was Galileo condemned? (1) It was because Galileo put forward his theory as an established fact, at a time when he could not and did not put forward arguments to establish it as a fact. The arguments which he, like his predecessors, Cusa and Copernicus, advanced gave the theory a strong probability but not certainty.

(2) Again Galileo attempted to prove his theory from Scripture. Galileo had not proved to demonstration the truth of his theory and modern men of science tell us that he could not have done so in his day.

Protestants as well as Catholics at the time did not accept Galileo's theory as proved. Bacon the great English philosopher rejected it with scorn. In 1596 the Protestant Theological Faculty of Tubingen condemned Kepler who was a celebrated astronomer for holding the theory that the earth moves round the sun.

The Infallibility of the Pope did not come into this question at all.

The story of Galileo dragging out a wretched existence in a dungeon is a Protestant fiction. Residence in a palace for a short time does not sound like solitary imprisonment in a dungeon.

It is needless to say that the Church is not opposed to science. She does everything within her power for the advancement of science. She has nothing to fear from science for there can be no contradiction between true science and true Theology. It is only when the science and the Theology are false that there can be con-

tradiction. Science is the hand-maid of Theology. Men advance theories and put them forward as if they were demonstrated facts without sufficient proof, and they think that because the Church does not at once accept their theory as a fact that it is opposed to science. Their theory might be false.

We shall say a few words about the third Canon of the Fourth Lateran Council, A.D. 1215. Protestants are very fond of this Canon, they think it proves their charge of persecution, but it does not. This Canon was passed against the Albigenses, Brethren of the Free Spirit, &c., who were guilty of shocking acts against morality and decency. (See Milner, and the Protestant historian Mosheim.)

These sects were a revival of Manicheism in its worst form. They taught that there were two Deities. They forbade the propagation of the human species, and the marriage rights; but said that unnatural lusts were lawful. They permitted perjury. Said that the use of flesh and wine was unlawful, &c. The cause of humanity and morality were at stake and it was right to put down these heretics. If similar parties arose at the present day in England, the police would search them up and they would be punished in her Majesty's Courts of Justice. Some of them might be punished with death and others would get long terms of imprisonment with hard labour. In the middle ages the Inquisition did a great deal of the work which is now done by our police and the law courts.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

Prayers and Instructions.

Sign of the Cross.

In the name of the Father, ✠ and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. It is a holy and a pious practice to sign ourselves with the sign of the Cross. We thereby honour the mystery of the most Blessed Trinity; and we are also reminded of the Passion and death of Jesus Christ on the Cross. This practice has come down to us from Apostolic times.

Tertullian says:—"At every fresh step and change of place, whenever we come in or go out, when we put on our sandals or wash, or take our meals, or light our lamps; whether we are about to recline or sit down, and whenever we begin a conversation, we impress on our foreheads the sign of the cross."

St. Jerome says:—"Before every action, at every step, let your hand form the sign of the cross."

St. Cyril of Jerusalem writes:—"Let us not, therefore, be ashamed of the cross of Christ; but even though another hides it, do thou openly seal it on thy brow, that the devils, beholding that royal sign, may flee far away trembling. But make thou this sign when thou eatest and drinkest, sittest or liest down, risest up, speakest, walkest: in a word, on every occasion; for He who was crucified is above in the heavens."

Morning Prayers.

At waking in the morning say, O God, to Thee do I watch at break of day: for Thee my soul hath thirsted. Glory be to Thee, my God, for ever and for ever. Amen.

At rising and while dressing say, In the name of the

Father ✠, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. I will raise myself up from this bed of sleep to adore my God, my Saviour.

Hail, great and sovereign Lord of heaven and earth! I believe and confess that Thou art here, and with the most profound humiliation of my soul I exalt and adore Thee.

Praise, honour, and glory be to Thee, my God, for Thy infinite goodness towards me, in mercifully preserving me the night past, and bringing me safely to the beginning of a new day.

O my God, I offer up my soul and body, my memory, will, and understanding, my senses, thoughts, words, and all my actions, with all that I have or am, to Thy service and protection, this day and for ever.

O holy Trinity, one God, into Thy hands I commit myself and all my concerns now and at all times: watch over me, O my God, in mercy, and preserve my soul from sin.

When dressed kneel down and say, In the name of the Father ✠, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. Blessed be the holy and undivided Trinity, now and for ever more. Amen. Come, Holy Ghost, replenish the heart of thy servant, and kindle in me the fire of Thy Divine love. Amen.

Direct, we beseech Thee, O Lord, our actions by Thy holy inspirations, and carry them on by Thy gracious assistance, that every prayer and work of ours may begin always from Thee, and by Thee be happily ended, throught Christ our Lord. Amen.

Our Father.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name: Thy kingdom come: thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: and lead us not into temptation: but deliver us from evil. Amen.

Hail Mary.

Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou amongst women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary mother of God, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death. Amen.

Apostles' Creed.

I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ His only Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; He descended into hell; the third day He rose again from the dead; He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the living and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; the Holy Catholic Church; the Communion of Saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body and life everlasting. Amen.

Confiteor.

I confess to Almighty God, to Blessed Mary ever Virgin, to Blessed Michael the Archangel, to Blessed John the Baptist, to the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and to all the saints, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, *through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault.* Therefore I beseech the Blessed Mary ever Virgin, Blessed Michael the Archangel, Blessed John the Baptist, the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and all the Saints, to pray to the Lord our God for me.

An Act of Contrition.

O my God I am sorry and beg pardon for all my sins, and detest them above all things, because they deserve thy dreadful punishments, because they have crucified

my loving Saviour Jesus Christ, and, most of all, because they offend Thine infinite goodness; and I firmly resolve, by the help of thy grace, never to offend Thee again, and carefully to avoid the occasions of sin.

An Act of Faith.

O great God, I firmly believe all those sacred truths which Thy Holy Catholic Church believes and teaches, because Thou, who art truth itself, hast revealed them to her. Amen.

An Act of Hope.

O Almighty and most merciful God, I put my whole trust in Thee, and firmly hope for mercy, grace, and salvation from Thee, my God, through Jesus Christ my Saviour. Amen.

An Act of Charity.

O Lord my God, I love Thee with my whole heart, and above all things, because Thou O God, art the Sovereign Good, and for Thine own infinite perfections art most worthy of all my love, and for Thy sake I also love my neighbour as myself. I renounce every thought which is contrary to that love of one another, by which men are known to be the disciples of Thy Son; I forgive all who have in any way injured me, and I beg Thy grace and mercy for all the world.

The Angelus Domini.

℣. The Angel of the Lord declared unto Mary.
℟. *And she conceived of the Holy Ghost.*
Hail Mary, &c.
℣. Behold the handmaid of the Lord.
℟. *Be it done unto me according to Thy word.*
Hail Mary, &c.
℣. And the word was made flesh.
℟. *And dwelt amongst us.*
Hail Mary, &c.

Let us Pray.

Pour forth, we beseech Thee, O Lord, Thy grace into our hearts, that we, to whom the Incarnation of Christ Thy Son was made known by the message of an angel, may by His Passion and Cross, be brought to the glory of his resurrection, through the same Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

May the peace and blessing of Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, come down upon me, and abide with me for ever. Amen.

Evening Prayers.

℣. In the name of the Father ✠, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. ℟. Amen.

℣. Come, Holy Ghost, replenish the hearts of Thy faithful, and kindle in us the fire of Thy Divine love

℟. Amen.

Direct, we beseech Thee, O Lord, our actions by thy holy inspirations, and carry them on by Thy gracious assistance, that every prayer and work of ours may begin always from Thee, and by Thee be happily ended; through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Our Father, &c., as in morning prayer. At the words *through my fault* in the Confiteor pause for a time and examine your conscience.

O Almighty and eternal God, whose majesty filleth heaven and earth, we firmly believe that Thou art here, that Thy adorable eyes are upon us, that Thou seest and knowest all things, and art most intimately present in the very centre of our souls. We desire to bow down all the powers of our souls to adore Thee: we desire to join our voices with all Thy angels and saints, to praise and glorify Thy holy name.

We give thee thanks from our hearts for the numberless blessings Thou art continually bestowing upon us, and upon Thy whole Church, and particularly for Thy merciful preservation of us this day from the dangers incident to our condition, and from the miseries and calamities due to our sins. And since Thou hast ordained us the day

to labour, and the night to take our rest, as we praise Thee for the blessings of the day past, so we beg and beseech Thee for Thy merciful protection this night; let the eye of Thy Providence watch over us, O God, and let Thy holy angels pitch their tents around us, that being safely delivered from all danger and comfortably refreshed with moderate sleep, we may the better be enabled to perform the duties of our calling and state of life, and so daily advance to new victories over our passions, and a more perfect observance of thy holy commandments, till, living in thy fear and dying in Thy favour, we come to enjoy Thee for ever in Thy eternal kingdom: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

O glorious Virgin, Mother of God, we fly to thy motherly protection; we beseech thee to look upon us as thy children, and by thy powerful intercession with Thy blessed Son Jesus Christ, protect and defend us at all times, but especially at the hour of our death. Amen.

O angel guardian of our souls, to whose holy care we are committed, by thy supernal piety illuminate, defend, and protect us this night from all sin and danger. Amen.

Vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, O Lord, to render to all our benefactors, for Thy name's sake life everlasting. Amen.

Before the closing of the day
Creator, we Thee humbly pray,
That for Thy wonted mercy's sake,
Thou us into protection take.

May nothing in our minds excite,
Vain dreams and phantoms of the night;
Our enemy repress, that so,
Our bodies no uncleanness know.

In this most gracious Father, hear
Through Christ Thy equal Son, our prayer-
Who with the Holy Ghost and Thee,
Doth live and reign eternally. Amen

Save us, O Lord, waking, and keep us sleeping; that we may watch with Christ, and rest in peace. Amen.

Preserve us as the apple of Thine eye; and protect us under the shadow of Thy wings.

Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep us this night without sin.

Have mercy on us, O Lord; have mercy on us.

Thy mercy be upon us, O Lord, as we have put our trust in Thee.

O Lord, hear our prayer, and let our supplications come unto Thee.

Let us Pray.

Visit, we beseech Thee, O Lord, this habitation, and drive far from it all the snares of the enemy: let Thy holy angels dwell therein, to preserve us in peace, and Thy blessing be upon us for ever; through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Lastly, end with the Angelus Domini, as at end of Morning Prayer.

Instructions.

Lesson I.—On God.

Question. Who made the world?

Answer. God.

Q. Who is God?

A. The Creator and sovereign Lord of heaven and earth, and of all things.

Q. How many Gods are there?

A. There is but one God; who will reward the good and punish the wicked.

Q. Does God see us?

A. Yes; God is everywhere and sees and knows all things, even our most secret thoughts and actions. "*All things are naked and open to his eyes.*" Heb. iv. 13.

Lesson II.—On Man.

Q. What is man?

A. One of God's creatures, composed of a body and soul, and made to God's likeness.

Q. In what is man made to God's likeness?

A. In his soul.

Q. In what is man's soul like to God?

A. In being a spirit and immortal, and in being capable of knowing and loving God.

Q. What do you mean when you say that the soul is immortal?

A. I mean that it can never die.

Q. Why did God give us souls capable of knowing and loving Him?

A. That we might fulfil the end for which He made us.

Q. For what end did God make us?

A. To know and serve Him here on earth and after to see and enjoy Him for ever in heaven.

Q. How can we know God on earth?

A. By learning the truths He has taught.

Q. Where shall we find the truths God has taught?

A. They are chiefly contained in the *Apostles' Creed*. We are bound to believe all the truths contained in this Creed, and to believe them in the sense in which they are understood by the Catholic Church.

Q. Which are the principal mysteries of religion?

A. The Unity and Trinity of God, the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of our Saviour. We are then bound to believe that there is only one God, that in this one God there are three divine persons, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, that they are really distinct and equal in all things. That God the Son became man to redeem and save us; that in Jesus Christ there are two natures; the nature of God and the nature of man. He is true God and true man. He was God from eternity. He was man only from the time of His conception or Incarnation.

Lesson III.—On Sin.

Q. What is sin?

A. Sin is an offence against God, by any thought, word, deed, or omission, against the law of God.

Q. How many kinds of sin are there?

A. There are two kinds of sin, original sin and actual sin.

Q. What is original sin?

A. Original sin is that guilt and stain which we inherit from Adam, who was the origin and head of all mankind.

Q. What is actual sin?

A. Actual sin is every sin which we ourselves commit.

Q. How is actual sin divided?

A. Actual sin is divided into mortal sin and venial sin.

Q. What is mortal sin?

A. Mortal sin is a grievous offence against God.

Q. Why is it called mortal?

A. It is called mortal sin because it kills the soul and deserves hell.

Q. How does mortal sin kill the soul?

A. Mortal sin kills the soul by depriving it of sanctifying grace, which is the supernatural life of the soul.

Q. Is it a great evil to fall into mortal sin?

A. It is the greatest of all evils to fall into mortal sin.

Q. Where will they go who die in mortal sin?

A. They who die in mortal sin will go to hell for all eternity.

Q. What is venial sin?

A. Venial sin is an offence which does not kill the soul, yet displeases God, and often leads to mortal sin.

Q. Why is it called venial?

A. It is called venial because it is more easily pardoned than mortal sin.

Q. Is there a distinction between mortal sin and venial sin?

A. There is a distinction between mortal and venial sin. Just as there are big and small violations of the law of the land. Non-Catholics often say that small sins are just as bad as big ones.

Lesson IV.—On Prayer.

Q. What is Prayer?

A. Prayer is the raising up of the mind and heart to God.

Q. How do we raise up our mind and heart to God?

A. We raise up our mind and heart to God by thinking of God; by adoring, praising, and thanking Him: and by begging of Him all blessings for soul and body.

Q. Which is the best of all prayers?

A. The best of all prayers is the 'Our Father' or the Lord's prayer.

Q. Who made the Lord's prayer.

A. Jesus Christ Himself made the Lord's prayer.

Lesson V.—On the Ten Commandments

Q. How many commandments are there?

A. There are ten commandments.

Q. Say the commandments of God.

A. I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, and out of the house of bondage: thou shalt not have strange Gods before me. Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven thing, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not adore them nor serve them.

2. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

3. Remember that thou keep holy the sabbath day.

4. Honour thy father and thy mother.

5. Thou shalt not kill.

6. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

7. Thou shalt not steal.

8. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

9. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife.

10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods.

Q. Is it necessary to keep all and every one of the ten commandments?

A. Yes; the Scripture says, "*whosoever shall offend in one is become guilty of all:*" that is the observance of the other commandments will not avail him to salvation (St James ii. 10).

Q. Which is the first commandment.

A. I am the Lord thy God, &c.

Q. What is commanded by the first commandment?

A. We are commanded to worship the one, true and living God, by faith, hope, charity and religion.

Q. Does the first commandment forbid the making of images?

A. The first commandment does not forbid the making of images, but the making of idols; that is, it forbids us to make images to be adored or honoured as Gods.

Q. What kind of honour or worship should we pay to the angels and saints?

A. We should pay to the angels and saints an inferior honour or worship, for this is due to them as the servants and special friends of God.

Q. What honour should we pay to relics, crucifixes, and holy pictures?

A. We should give to relics, crucifixes and holy pictures, a relative honour, as they relate to Christ and His Saints and are memorials of them.

Q. Do we pray to relics and images?

A. We do not pray to relics, or images, for they can neither see, nor hear, nor help us.

On the Second Commandment.

Q. What is the second commandment?

A. The second commandment is, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain'.

Q. What are we commanded to do by the second commandment?

A. We are commanded to speak with reverence of God and all holy persons and things, and to keep our lawful oaths and vows.

Q. What does the second commandment forbid?
A. It forbids all false, rash, unjust, and unnecessary oaths; as also blaspheming, cursing, and profane words.

On the Third Commandment.

Q. What is the third commandment?
A. Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath-day.
Q. What are we commanded by the third commandment?
A. We are commanded to keep the Sunday holy.
Q. How are we to keep the Sunday holy?
A. By hearing Mass and resting from servile works.
Q. Why are we commanded to rest from servile works?
A. We are commanded to rest from servile works that we may have time and opportunity for prayer, going to the Sacraments, hearing instructions, and reading good books.

On the Fourth Commandment.

Q. What is the fourth commandment?
A. Honour thy father and thy mother.
Q. What are we commanded by the fourth commandment?
A. We are commanded to love, reverence, and obey our parents in all that is not sin.
Q. Are we commanded to obey our parents only?
A. We are commanded to obey, not only our parents, but also our bishops and pastors, the civil authorities, and our lawful superiors.
Q. Are we bound to assist our parents in their wants?
A. We are bound to assist our parents in their wants, both spiritual and temporal.

On the Fifth Commandment.

Q. What is the fifth commandment?
A. Thou shalt not kill.

Q. What does the fifth commandment forbid?
A. It forbids all wilful murder, fighting quarrelling, and injurious words; and also scandal and bad example.

The Sixth and Ninth Commandments.

Q. What is the sixth commandment?
A. Thou shall not commit adultery.
Q. What does the sixth commandment forbid?
A. It forbids all sins of impurity with another's wife or husband.
Q. What else is forbidden by the sixth commandment?
A. It forbids whatever is contrary to holy purity in looks, words or actions. It therefore forbids immodest plays, and dances, immodest books, songs and pictures because they are most dangerous to the soul, and lead to mortal sin.
Q. What is the ninth commandment?
A. Thou shall not covet thy neighbour's wife.
Q. What does the ninth commandment forbid?
A. It forbids all wilful consent to impure thoughts and desires, and all wilful pleasure in irregular motions of the flesh.

On the Seventh, Eight and Tenth Commandment.

Q. What is the seventh commandment?
A. Thou shall not steal.
Q. What does the seventh commandment forbid?
A. It forbids all unjust taking, or keeping what belongs to another; as also all manner of cheating in buying and selling.
Q. Are we bound to restore ill-gotten goods?
A. We are bound to restore ill-gotten goods if we are able, or else the sin will not be forgiven, we must also pay our debts.
Q. Is it dishonest in servants to waste their master's time or property?
A. It is dishonest in servants to waste their master's

time or property, because it is wasting what is not their own.

Q. What is the eighth commandment?

A. Thou shall not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

Q. What does the eight commandment forbid?

A. It forbids all false testimony, rash judgment, and lies, as also calumny, detraction, tale-bearing, and any words which injure our neighbour's character.

Q. What is the tenth commandment?

A. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods.

Q. What does the tenth commandment forbid?

A. It forbids all envious and covetous thoughts, and unjust desires of our neighbour's goods and profits.

On the Precepts of the Church.

Q. Are we bound to obey the Church?

A. We are bound to obey the Church, because Christ has said to the pastors of the Church, 'He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me' (St. Luke x. 16).

Q. What are the chief Commandments of the Church?

A. The chief commandments of the Church are;

1. To hear Mass on Sundays, and all holidays of obligation.
2. To fast and abstain on the days commanded.
3. To confess our sins at least once a year.
4. To receive worthily the Blessed Eucharist at Easter, or within the time appointed.
5. To contribute to the support of our pastors.
6. Not to solemnize marriage at the forbidden times, nor to marry persons within the forbidden degrees of kindred, or otherwise prohibited by the Church, nor clandestinely.

Lesson VI. The Sacraments.

Q. What is a sacrament?

A. A sacrament is an outward sign of inward grace,

ordained by Jesus Christ, by which grace is given to our souls.

Q. Do the sacraments always give grace?

A. The sacraments always give grace to those who receive them worthily, and they have this power of giving grace from the merits of Christ's Precious Blood, which they apply to our souls.

Q. How many sacraments are there?

A. There are seven sacraments; Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Order, and Matrimony.

Q. What is Baptism?

A. Baptism is a sacrament which cleanses us from original sin, make us Christians, Children of God, and members of the Church.

Q. How is Baptism given?

A. Baptism is given by pouring water on the head of the child, saying at the same time these words, 'I baptise thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Baptism is necessary for Salvation, because Christ has said, 'Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.' (St. John iii. 5).

Q. What is Confirmation.

A. Confirmation is a sacrament by which we receive the Holy Ghost, in order to make us strong and perfect Christians and soldiers of Jesus Christ.

The Bishop gives Confirmation by praying that the Holy Ghost may come down upon those who are to be confirmed; and by laying his hands upon them, and making the sign of the cross with chrism on their foreheads at the same time saying, "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Q. What is the Holy Eucharist?

A. The Holy Eucharist is the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, together with His soul and Divinity under the appearance of bread and wine.

The bread and wine are changed into the Body and

Blood of Christ by the power of God, to whom nothing is impossible or difficult. Christ is received whole and entire under either species.

Q. In order to receive the Blessed Sacrament worthily what is required ?

A. It is required that we should be in the state of grace, and fasting from midnight. To be in the state of grace is to be free from mortal sin. It is a great sin to receive unworthily.

Q. Is the Blessed Eucharist a Sacrament only ?

A. The Blessed Eucharist is not a Sacrament only ; it is also a sacrifice.

Q. What is a sacrifice.

A. A sacrifice is the offering of a victim by a priest to God alone, in testimony of His being the Sovereign Lord of all things.

Q. What is the Sacrifice of the New Law ?

A. The Sacrifice of the New Law is the Holy Mass.

Q. What is the Holy Mass ?

A. The Holy Mass is the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, really present on the altar under the appearance of bread and wine, and offered to God for the living and the dead.

Q. Is the Holy Mass one and the same Sacrifice with that of the Cross ?

A. The Holy Mass is one and the same Sacrifice with that of the Cross, inasmuch as Christ, Who offered Himself, a bleeding Victim, on the Cross to His Heavenly Father, continues to offer Himself in an unbloody manner on the altar, through the ministry of His priests.

Q. For what ends is the Sacrifice of the Mass offered ?

A. It is offered up for four ends. First to give supreme honour and glory to God. Secondly to thank God for all His benefits. Thirdly to obtain pardon for our sins. Fourthly to obtain all other graces and blessings through Jesus Christ.

The Mass is also a memorial of the Passion and Death of our Lord, for Christ at His last supper said,

'Do this for a commemoration of Me' (St. Luke xxii. 19).

Q. What is the Sacrament of Penance?

A. Penance is a Sacrament whereby the sins, whether mortal or venial, which we have committed after Baptism are forgiven.

Q. How many parts are there in the Sacrament of Penance?

A. There are four parts in the Sacrament of Penance, viz., Contrition, Confession, Satisfaction, and Absolution.

Q. What is Contrition?

A. Contrition is a hearty sorrow for our sins, because by them we have offended so good a God, together with a firm purpose of amendment. Contrition may be of two kinds, viz., *perfect* or *imperfect*.

Perfect Contrition is sorrow for sin which arises from the pure love of God.

Imperfect Contrition is sorrow for sin which arises from some other inferior motive; such as the fear of hell, or the loss of heaven.

Q. What is Confession?

A. Confession means to accuse ourselves of our sins to a priest approved by the Bishop. Jesus Christ gave power to His Apostles and their successors to forgive sins, "Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven, &c. (St. John xx. 23). To conceal wilfully a mortal sin in Confession is a great sacrilege.

Q. What is Satisfaction?

A. Satisfaction is doing the penance given us by the priest. The object of satisfaction is to repair the temporal punishment due to sin.

Q. What is Extreme Unction?

A. The Sacrament of Extreme Unction is the anointing of the sick with holy oil, accompanied by prayer. "And they cast out many devils and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them" (St. Mark vi. 13). "Is any man sick among you? let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, &c. (St. James v. 14).

Q. What is the Sacrament of Holy Orders?

A. Holy Orders is the Sacrament by which Bishops, priests, and other ministers of the Church are ordained, and receive power and grace to perform their sacred duties.

Q. What is the Sacrament of Matrimony?

A. Matrimony is the Sacrament which sanctifies the contract of a Christian marriage, and gives a special grace to those who receive it worthily.

Q. Can any human power dissolve the bond of marriage?

A. No human power can dissolve the bond of marriage, because Christ has said, "what God hath joined together let no man put asunder." (St. Matt. xix 6).

The Way of the Cross.

I. Jesus is condemned to death.
II. Jesus receives the Cross.
III. Jesus falls the first time under His Cross.
IV. Jesus is met by His Blessed mother.
V. The Cross is laid upon Simon of Cyrene.
VI. Veronica wipes the face of Jesus.
VII. Jesus falls the second time.
VIII. Jesus speaks to the women of Jerusalem.
IX. Jesus falls the third time.
X. Jesus is stripped of His garments.
XI. Jesus is nailed to the Cross.
XII. Jesus dies upon the Cross.
XIII. Jesus is laid in the arms of His Blessed mother.
XIV. Jesus is laid in the Sepulchre.

Holy Rosary.

I. The Five Joyful Mysteries.

1. The Annunciation.
2. The Visitation.
3. The Nativity.
4. The Presentation in the Temple.
5. The Finding in the Temple.

II. The Five Sorrowful Mysteries,

1. The Agony in the Garden.
2. The Scourging at the Pillar.
3. The Crowning with Thorns.
4. The Carrying of the Cross.
5. The Crucifixion.

III. The Five Glorious Mysteries

1. The Resurrection.
2. The Ascension.
3. The Coming of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles.
4. The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin.
5. The Coronation of the Blessed Virgin.

The Divine Praises.

Blessed be God.
Blessed be His Holy Name.
Blessed be Jesus Christ, true God and true man.
Blessed be the Name of Jesus.
Blessed be the most Sacred Heart of Jesus.
Blessed be Jesus in the most Holy Sacrament of the Altar.
Blessed be the great Mother of God, Mary most holy.
Blessed be her Holy and Immaculate Conception.
Blessed be the Name of Mary Virgin and Mother.
Blessed be God in his Angels and in his Saints.

Come, O Holy Spirit.

Come, O Holy Spirit, fill the hearts of Thy faithful, and kindle in them the fire of thy love.

Send forth Thy Spirit, and they shall be created. *And Thou shalt renew the face of the earth.*

O God, who hast taught the hearts of the faithful by the light of the Holy Spirit, grant that, by the gift of the same Spirit, we may be always truly wise, and ever rejoice in His consolation. Through Christ our Lord.

Grace Before Meals.

Bless us, O Lord, and these Thy gifts, which we are going to receive, from Thy bounty, through Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Grace After Meals.

We give Thee thanks, Almighty God, for all Thy benefits, who livest and reignest world without end. Amen. May the souls of the faithful departed, through the mercy of God, rest in peace. *Amen*

Prayer to our Angel Guardian.

O Angel of God to whose holy care I am committed! enlighten and direct me, defend and govern me, this day, and during my whole life. *Amen.*

Prayer to our Patron Saint.

O happy Saint whose name I bear! pray for me, that I may serve God faithfully in this life as thou hast done, and thereby merit to be united with thee in praising and glorifying Him eternally in heaven. *Amen.*

A form of Confession.

Always prepare yourself well for the Holy Sacrament of Penance. Begin by thanking God for His goodness and His mercy in sparing you so long, and in giving you time to repent. Ask the grace of God to make a good confession, that you may do the work of God well. Then examine your conscience, that you may know your sins and the number of times you have committed them. Examine yourself on the Ten Commandments of God, the Six Precepts of the Church, the Seven Deadly Sins. Pass over in your mind how you have spent your time and see if you have gone into any occasions of sin.

When you have discovered your sins and their num-

ber, to the best of your ability; tell God how sorry you are for having offended Him, and promise never again to be guilty of them; then make an act of Perfect Contrition. Then enter the confessional, and kneeling down, make the sign of the Cross and say: '*Pray Father give me your blessing, for I have sinned.*' Say the '*Confiteor*' as far as the words '*through my most grievous fault.*' After you have done this tell the priest how long it is since your last confession, and accuse yourself of your sins taking care to be sorry for each and every *mortal sin*, to confess every *mortal sin*, and to resolve to avoid all and every *mortal sin* in the future. Confess your sins just as they stand before God. Do not make them less than what they are. Do not make them worse than what they are. Confess all, giving the number of times and any circumstances which may add to their guilt. Consider yourself as kneeling at the feet of Jesus Christ; whose minister the priest is. When you have finished telling your sins, say: 'For these, and all my other sins which I cannot recollect, I most humbly ask pardon of God, and penance and absolution of you, my ghostly father.' Then say the latter part of the 'Confiteor', and the Act of Contrition. Listen to the advice of the confessor. Take care to know your penance, and perform it within a reasonable time. Renew your sorrow for your sins when the priest pronounces the words of absolution, and thank God for having allowed you to partake of the grace of this great Sacrament.

The Salve Regina.

Hail, holy Queen, Mother of Mercy, hail, our life, our sweetness, and our hope! To thee do we cry, poor banished children of Eve; to thee do we send up our sighs, mourning and weeping in this vale of tears.

Turn then, most gracious advocate, thine eyes of mercy towards us; and after this our exile, show unto us the blessed fruit of Thy womb, Jesus. O clement, O loving, O sweet Virgin Mary.

℣. Pray for us, O holy Mother of God.

℟. *That we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ.*

A Prayer for the Conversion of England.

O Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God and our most gentle Queen and Mother, look down in mercy upon England thy Dowry and upon us all who greatly hope and trust in thee. By thee it was that Jesus our Saviour and our hope was given unto the world; and He has given thee to us that we might hope still more. Plead for us thy children, whom thou didst receive and accept at the foot of the Cross. O Sorrowful Mother! interecede for our separated brethren; that with us in the one true fold they may be united to the Chief Shepherd, the Vicar of thy Son. Pray for us all, dear Mother that by faith fruitful in good works, we may all deserve to see and praise God, together with thee in our heavenly home. Amen. (Letter to the English People, Leo XIII.)

Short Proofs for the Truth of the Catholic Church.

1. The Catholic Church has Unity and the other marks of the Church of Christ. It has Sanctity, Catholicity and Apostolicity. No other Church has all these four marks, and any Church which has not all these four marks cannot be true.

2. The Catholic Church exists at the present day. It existed five hundred years ago, and so on back to the days of Christ, and it was set up by Christ Himself. This can be said of no other Church. The Church that was true a thousand years ago must be true to-day, and will remain true for ever.

3. The true Church must be Divine. The Catholic Church claims to be Divine. The other religions are satisfied with being considered human and they are so in reality. Every one of them has a human stamp upon it. They have come into existence a short time ago, and

are called after the name of their founder, or the country where they first started, or some peculiarity in their teaching.

4 The Catholic Church is Infallible and no other Church claims this gift. The Church of Christ must be Infallible because God would not command us to follow a guide which might lead us into error. Therefore the Catholic Church alone corresponds with the Church of Christ in this respect.

5. The whole Catholic Church is in communion with the see of Peter, and Christ built his Church upon Peter (St. Matt. xvi. 18).

6. The Catholic Church is of all nations. It is not national like the others, and she teaches the same things everywhere. She is not ashamed of having the poor, and she is not ashamed to go after sinners to reclaim them. The Catholic Church has the same good things for the rich and the poor.

7 The Catholic Church is a kingdom in itself. It has its own head, its own governors, and its own subjects. It makes its own laws, &c. The State makes laws for the others. Christ said that His Church should be a kingdom.

8 The Catholic Church is true because it is hated by the world and this was foretold of her by Jesus Christ.

9 The Catholic Church is the Church of the Scripture. It does not permit of divorce as the Protestant Church does. 'What God hath joined together let no man separate' (St. Matt. xix. 6). It anoints with oil people in danger of death by sickness in accordance with St. Mark vi. 13. "And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them"; and St. James v. 14. "Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord."

10 The Catholic Church teaches Confession in accordance with St. John xx. 22. 23: and it believes in presence of Jesus Christ in the Blessed Eucharist, believing that it is a great Sacrament and also a Sacrifice.

Many outside the Catholic Church have a wrong idea of the Church of Christ. The idea they have is that of whatever sect they were brought up in. They think that it is human, that it can teach error, and contradiction, &c. The true Church of Christ could never be of this kind. It must be Divine and Infallible.

Many people also when they are examining the claims of the Catholic Church fix upon a few points and make these their difficulties. It would be better for them to take a broader view and ask themselves is the Catholic Church the one true Church of Christ? If so they may be certain that whatever it teaches is revealed truth. They can rest satisfied that if the Catholic Church is true that its teaching on every point is sound, because the Church of Christ could not teach false doctrines even on one point. If it did it could not be the true Church. And the gates of hell would have prevailed against it. But this cannot be, because Christ has said that they shall not prevail over His Church. Therefore it can never teach falsehood, but shall ever teach what is true.

THE END.

PRINTED AT
ST. WILLIAM'S PRESS,
MARKET WEIGHTON, YORKS.